

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

THE responsibility of the laity for evangelism is a cardinal tenet of all zealous and forward-looking churchmen to-day, and with good reason; for it seems obvious that many of our contemporaries will never hear the gospel unless the ordinary Christian believer, in conversation with friends and acquaintances, bears witness to the faith that is in him. Contacts in the hours of work and leisure provide the occasions in this generation for the communication of the gospel to take place; but the problem of communication so far as language is concerned still remains. It can never be easy for the religious man to state his faith in non-religious language: in fact, it may well prove impossible. For the Christian there can never be a substitute for the Scriptures, and while translations into modern speech may remove needless obstacles to understanding, no translation can modernize the thought of the Biblical writers, if by that one means expressing religious thoughts in words coloured by a secular outlook.

The Christian cannot give an account of his faith without using certain Biblical words; but he must reckon with the fact that these words have either dropped out of the common speech of this generation or have acquired meanings and associations different from those which they bear in the Christian vocabulary. Just here there arises a difficulty even for the zealous and instructed Christian who would commend his faith. His very familiarity with such words may make it difficult for him to give a precise definition of their meaning and to distinguish between the suggestions which they convey to his own mind and the suggestions which they convey to the non-Christian outsider.

A book just published—*Christian Words and Christian Meanings*—addresses itself to this situation. It consists of a course of lectures delivered last year at Cambridge by the Regius Professor of Divinity under the auspices of the Faculty. Professor BURNABY believes that it is both possible and needful for Christians to know and to be ready to say what they mean by the

¹ Hodder and Stoughton; 9s. 6d. net.

words which have been, perhaps irrevocably, consecrated to Christian use. His aim in this book is to help not so much in the defence of the Christian faith as in its clarification. He would like to make some of these words 'sound again with their Christian ring,' and the words he has chosen he deals with in pairs—faith and knowledge, revelation and dogma, love and incarnation, sin and judgment, forgiveness and atonement, sacrifice and communion, grace and freedom, salvation and hope. Let us see how he deals with grace and freedom.

Grace is St. Paul's word, but his use of it is in line with the meaning suggested by the common Old Testament expression 'find grace in the sight of' some one. Grace is favour shown by a superior to an inferior, and for the latter to find grace in the sight of the former is to receive a kindly treatment that is quite undeserved. St. Paul carries this further in the light of his own amazing discovery that he has been chosen by God to be an apostle despite his persecution of the Christ and His people. Grace for him is not merely the undeserved favour of God, but that favour bestowed where what was deserved was condemnation and wrath. Grace is the activity of the gracious God—an activity that not only cancels the debt of an evil past, but that transforms the sinner, giving a new outlook to the mind, arousing new affections in the heart, imparting new strength and direction to the will and therefore with a new sense of freedom.

The New Testament language of freedom, however, is not to be understood in terms of modern psychology or modern politics. Its background picture is the persistent subjection of God's people, because of their sins, to the rule of heathen empires. That alien rule symbolizes the dominion of evil, from which men, as captives, need to be ransomed. Man has lost his freedom by falling into the hands of usurpers; he regains it when his rightful sovereign is restored. Freedom, therefore, is not the lack of all authority; it is submission to the right authority, to the true Lord of all. Thus, as our author says, in the New

Testament there can be no opposition between grace and freedom, for freedom is just what the grace of God confers.

Unfortunately, as the controversies in the Church about grace have shown, there is a constant tendency to separate grace as an activity of God and grace as a gift conferred on man, grace in its source and grace in its outcome. Thus grace comes to be conceived as a 'thing' to be miraculously imparted or infused instead of as a gracious personal relationship (to use John Oman's phrase)—a relationship in which goodness evokes gratitude, thus uniting Giver and receiver.

The pattern of Christian freedom is our Lord Himself who came not to do His own will but the will of the Father who sent Him, and the pattern of grace is the Incarnation wherein God so perfectly united Himself to humanity that there was no division between what was of God and what was of man. In Christ the Divine love and the human response are inseparable. In His people, alas, the situation is different, for the freedom of the sons of God is constantly at issue with our hankering after the false freedom of mere independence. The true freedom is not the condition but the creation of that gracious personal relationship between God and His children, which, on their side, is not a 'state' of grace but a growing into grace as they receive of His fulness and work out their own salvation with fear and trembling because it is God that worketh in them both to will and to do.

In the current periodical literature there is an abundance of important and valuable material. *The London Quarterly and Holborn Review* contains an outstanding series of six articles on various aspects of the work of the Holy Spirit. *The Hibbert Journal* has a valuable article on 'Religious Experience as a Court of Appeal,' by W. Arnold HALL. *Theology* has a suggestive—and somewhat provocative—article on 'Faith in the Healing Miracles of the Synoptic Gospels' in which ALAN SHAW argues that the faith which produced miracles in the New Testament has nothing to do with subjective faith or trust in Jesus, but means faith in the fact that Jesus was the Messiah. But out of all the periodicals we think that the most important and illuminating article is that by the Rev. B. M. G. REARDON in *The Congregational Quarterly* on 'Christian Dogma and Scientific Method.'

The present-day Christian apologist has to meet a prejudice. He is held to be presenting a system

while the characteristic interest of to-day is in *method*. 'Systems, of their very nature,' so it is argued, 'are *a priori* and more or less arbitrary.' A system involves, so it is objected, 'an *a priori* construction of a dogma imposed by authority and impervious to criticism. It has—in the past at all events—been forced upon children before the age when conscious reflection and intelligent decision are at all possible, and maintains itself only by the repetition of traditional practices and formulæ.' Method, on the other hand, 'explores, investigates, scrutinises.' Method is interested not in speculations, but in facts. It is argued, therefore, that systems stifle the truth, whereas methods discover the truth.

It is to some extent true that method and system represent the interest of two types of mind. A system involves a pattern in which each element is seen in dependence upon every other. The danger is that the architect of a system may be so interested in producing his pattern that he sacrifices fact to theory. On the other hand, he whose interest is in method is not interested in constructing a pattern. 'What he looks for is not so much Truth as its more modest components, *facts*.' Just because of that, the person whose interest is in method is much more likely to arrive at the truth, for he takes no theory and no pattern to the facts.

Such then is the argument, and the question is, Is Christianity a system or a method? Christianity, argues Dr. REARDON, is based on certain historical facts—'the call and preparation of the Jews, the advent of the Messiah, His life, death, and resurrection, and the supernatural energizing of the community which He founded.' Now if that be so, then Christianity must use every possible historical method to verify its facts. Its history must be submitted to the most stringent historical tests. Here the Christian *system* depends on *method*. But—and it is a vast 'but'—the Christian sees in these historical facts 'supernatural' activity. These facts are history, but they transcend history; they are indeed the action of God. The Christian facts demand certain beliefs. The Incarnation demands a belief in the existence of a certain kind of God. The miracles deny a closed system of Nature. The Resurrection involves a life beyond death.

In view of that the Christian faith demands not only historical verification; it demands *philosophical* verification. Dr. REARDON sees a danger in the modern emphasis on Biblical theology, because Biblical theology tells us what the New Testament writers believed, but does not deal with

the verification which makes it possible for us to believe the same things. Philosophical verification must start with a man's own consciousness of himself, and of desires and aspirations which finite ends cannot satisfy. The question which must be asked, as a beginning, is why should this actual fact of experience be so?

Dr. REARDON does not enter further into this; but he lays it down that the claims of Christianity depend on a twofold proof—that God, 'transcendent and providential, exists, and that the Christian tradition regarding Jesus Christ is substantially authentic.'

Even then 'proof' in matters of religion cannot have the force of mathematical demonstration. It illuminates the understanding, but does not compel acceptance; 'a margin of doubt always remains in which the wilful sceptic can entrench himself.' Further, Christian committal is the committal of the whole man. 'To believe as a Christian believes means not only an adherence of the intellect but a purification of the moral personality. And the light of truth is not always welcome.'

Paul's Method not a Demonstration but an Exhibition of the Spirit

BY THE REVEREND C. CLARE OKE, M.A., Th.D., DOVER CENTRE, ONTARIO, CANADA

'My speech and my message were not in the form of plausible arguments of wisdom but in the form of an exhibition of Spirit and of power.'—Paul in 1 Co 2⁴.

THE key-word here ἀπόδειξις is universally taken nowadays in its developed sense of 'demonstration' or 'proof,' 'the technical term for a proof drawn from facts or documents, as opposed to theoretical reasoning' (Heinrici; so Edwards, G. G. Findlay, E.V., Moffatt, Weymouth, Goodspeed, C. K. Williams, R.S.V.). That sense, however, even though the supposed demonstration is supplied by 'the Spirit, with His power' (Findlay) is foreign to Paul's course of thought. Paul has been claiming that Christianity, a Divine, transcendent thing, must not be reduced to a philosophy or theory expressed with some attention to its form, as the shallow high-brows at Corinth desired and as Apollos may unconsciously have abetted them in concluding. That was the misconception that was precisely responsible for the development of bitter controversy and partisanship. 'Stop thinking of Christianity as something in which ingenuity or impressiveness counts,' Paul was saying. 'That is totally to misconceive of our religion and lies at the root of your division.' The Divine and

The man who is playing the fool will always be only too glad to say that there is no God.

There is then an absolute necessity of *method* in Christian faith. Historical and philosophical verification are necessary. But there is system, too. Theology has to work out a pattern in which it shows 'the interaction and the mutual dependence of the visible and the invisible, the temporal and the eternal, examining the data of revelation in the light of the speculative reason.'

To accuse Christianity of being a closed and arbitrary and *a priori* system is wrong. To say that Christianity is oblivious to the necessity of method is untrue. The Christian must always be ready to give a reason for the hope that is in him. As Augustine said: '*Turpe est sine ratione cuiquam credere.*' No man is more guilty of slavery to system than the determined sceptic who argues on the system that the case of religion cannot be argued and has no basis. A correct understanding of Christianity involves the use of method to arrive at system. The one is the necessary complement of the other.

humbling, non-contentious character of Christianity is shown, the apostle submitted, in three ways: by the gospel's obvious independence of human intelligence (1^{18a}); by the lowly calibre of those called (1^{26a}); and by the manner in which he had consistently introduced the gospel at Corinth (2¹⁻⁵), not humanly and self-confidently but in an effacement of himself that allowed the Spirit to indicate His presence and power effectively.

'And I (like yourselves in lack of intellectuality and social influence) at my coming to you, fellow-Christians, did not come aiming at eminence in speech or wisdom in proclaiming to you the testimony of God. For I did not judge it fit to know anything among you except Jesus Christ and Him as crucified.' Dr. Stanley Jones provides an apt parallel. 'When I first went to India I was trying to hold a very long line—a line that stretched clear from Genesis to Revelation, on to Western Civilization and to the Western Christian Church. I found myself bobbing up and down that line . . . I was worried. There was no well-defined issue

... I had the ill-defined but instinctive feeling that the heart of the matter was being left out. Then I saw that I could, and should, shorten my line, that I could take my stand at Christ and before that non-Christian world refuse to know anything save Jesus Christ and Him crucified... I saw that the gospel lies in the person of Jesus, that He Himself is the Good News, that my one task was to live and to present Him' (*The Christ of the Indian Road*, 16 f.). 'And I appeared before you in weakness and in fear and in considerable agitation. And my speech (manner of presentation) and my message were not in the form of plausible arguments of wisdom but in the form of an exhibition of Spirit and of power that your faith might rest not in men's wisdom but in God's power.'

The primary sense of the word ἀπόδειξις is 'display' or 'exhibition' and that was the meaning taken from the Greek by Jerome in the Vulgate which reads *in ostentione spiritus, et virtutis*. It is to be noted that the word which Paul uses in 12⁷, φανέρωσις, in the phrase 'the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good' is analogous to or congruent with 'exhibition' rather than 'demonstration.'

It is significant that the same need of a reversion to the meaning of 'display' has been felt with respect to ἐνδειξις in Ro 3²⁵. That word meant primarily 'a pointing out' or 'showing' from which meaning it came also to have the sense of 'proof' or 'demonstration.' The latter is the meaning adopted by Denney in the *E.G.T.*, Weymouth, Moffatt, N. P. Williams in the *Gore Commentary*, C. K. Williams in *The New Testament in Plain English*, R.S.V. 'showing' and 'proof' (3²⁶). But long ago Häring took the ἐνδειξις of God's righteousness here to be the same as the 'revelation' of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in 1⁷, or the 'manifestation' of it in 3²¹. And C. Anderson Scott, apparently in spite of Denney's quoting of that view only to reject it, warmly endorses it. Three of his sentences deserve quotation: 'It is righteousness as an abstract quality of the divine nature which is [generally] understood to have been challenged, and now to be demonstrated, whereas Paul is interested in it, mainly if not wholly, as a quality of the divine nature which reaches men in the form of justification or salvation. . . . The word "display" ranges with "is being revealed" (1⁷) and "has been manifested" (3²¹) as referring to a manifestation of divine righteousness which makes its arrival in the experience of men. It is a "display" which has for its result what is experience in 8¹, "there is now no condemnation to those that are in Christ Jesus"' (*Abingdon Bible Commentary*, 1144a). It is surely significant that the R.S.V. retains 'showing' in 3²⁵ as well as 'proof' in 3²⁶, and that Sanday and

Headlam use the word 'display' twice in their paraphrase of the meaning. The word is used also in 2 Co 8²⁴ where it has to do with love and where it is usually rendered 'proof.' But Coventry Patmore once wrote in one of his poems,

In divinity and love
What's best worth saying can't be said.

And it cannot be *proved* either. A passion to save and uplift or, on the human level, to help and enrich, cannot be conclusively demonstrated—it can only be exercised and exhibited for a surmising of its nature and a response to it.

It was to Paul utterly inconsistent with the nature of the God revealed by Christ that Christian ministers like himself should try to entice or force human minds by attractive or overwhelming rhetoric. But it would be quite as inconsistent with the love of God for His own Spirit or Self (2¹¹, which is curiously ignored in expositions of the meaning of the Spirit) to seduce or compel men's minds. Once we consider the implication of the word 'demonstration' or 'proof,' it is ruled out as a Divine method of procedure. We cannot entertain the idea that God would resort to a bludgeoning of men's minds into an acceptance of the salvation of Christ. God's omnipotence is the omnipotence of love. 'We must interpret the divine,' writes A. Seth Pringle-Pattison in that uniquely beautiful philosophical work *The Idea of God*, 'on the analogy of what we feel to be profoundest in our own experience. And if so, the omnipotence of God will mean neither the tawdry trappings of regal pomp nor the irresistible might of a physical force. The Divine omnipotence consists in the all-compelling power of goodness and love to enlighten the grossest darkness and to melt the hardest heart. . . . It is of the essence of the divine prerogative to seek no other means of triumph—as, indeed, a real triumph is possible on no other terms' (p. 411 f.). The strategy of God who confines Himself to drawing rather than to driving or incontestably proving has been well described by Dr. George A. Buttrick in his great book, *Prayer*. 'We can partly understand why God should reveal Himself by gleam and hint rather than in dazzling light, by shadow and footfall rather than by indubitable presence. An obtrusive God, His "I" written in a mammoth letter in every sky, His thunderous tones drowning all human speech, would not be Godlike. Besides, we would be "blinded by excess of light," for our sight is yet dim. If He is intent on our perfecting, He cannot coerce us.' What the Spirit uses is an 'exhibition' of Himself in the best sense of that word, an exercise of His ἀγάπη or self-denying, self-giving love, and of the kind of power which is in that.

Contemporary Religious Trends

Modern Methods of Evangelism

BY THE REVEREND DR. A. SKEVINGTON WOOD, PAISLEY

IN the year 1906 Mr. Richard Mudie Smith produced a systematic census of Church attendance in London which came as a shock to Anglicans and Free Churchmen alike. With such disturbing facts pressing upon the thoughts of his hearers, Dr. J. H. Jowett devoted part of his address from the Chair of the Congregational Union to a shrewd analysis of public reaction to the Christian Church. His conclusions are as relevant to-day as they were then and, with Dr. John Highet's statistics for Glasgow in 1954 and 1955 fresh in our mind and on our conscience, we should do well to give heed to them.

Dr. Jowett divided the classes unattracted to, or alienated from, the Church into three main groups: (1) Those who never think about us at all; (2) Those who have thought about us, and, as a result of their thinking, have determined to ignore us; and (3) Those who think about us and who are constrained by their thinking into the fiercest and most determined opposition. 'To the warp and woof of the daily life of the first group,' Dr. Jowett contended, 'the Churches contributed no thread—"to this particular class we simply do not exist." To the second class, the Churches were, for all simple, positive and progressive purposes, no longer any good—"we are exhausted batteries." To the third class the Church was a perverse, nefarious and perverting influence, ministering to mental and moral paralysis—"a foul fungus souring the common soil."' ¹

That assessment has not lost its pungency with the passing of the years. It remains a discerningly accurate summary of popular estimates of the Church to-day. As the leader of the 'Tell Scotland' Movement, Tom Allan, commented not long ago, ² the Church is still irrelevant to a vast number of our population, despite the striking impact of recent crusades, and the Christian community is presented with a continuing challenge in fulfilling its missionary task.

In considering whether the Church is adequately equipped and sufficiently aware to meet this testing situation, we must measure not only the depth of her spiritual resources but also the scope of her evangelistic technique. The first, of course, is fundamental. No inroads will be made upon the rampant paganism of our time without a

realized theology. 'The faith which was once for all delivered to the saints' ³ must be reborn in the present experience of the Church and communicated through the Spirit as a living message. Method is of secondary importance compared with the primacy of the Word. But it is not on that account to be either overlooked or underestimated. The 'how' of evangelism is by no means to be neglected.

What, we may proceed to inquire, are evangelistic methods to be? By what means is the everlasting gospel to be conveyed and communicated? The present-day answer can be condensed to a familiar phrase—'by all means.' The modern evangelist would insist that we must employ every available method to offer Christ. There is Scriptural warrant for such a comprehensive commission. Writing to the Corinthians, St. Paul gives us a glimpse of his own evangelistic strategy. 'I have become all things to all men,' he says, 'that I might by all means save some.' ⁴ The haunting little slogan 'by all means' is embedded in the Word itself. In prosecuting the task of mission no possibility will be unexamined.

Beside *all* waters sow,
The highway furrows grow,
Drop it where thorns and thistles grow,
Scatter it on the rock.

This same inclusiveness governs the current conception of the agents of evangelism. In the past we have been inclined to suppose that evangelism was a sectional concern that could be safely left to the expert few. It was not for every member, not even for every minister. When souls appeared to be ripening, we sent for a combined harvester from the Home Board, or its denominational equivalent. Nowadays we see that this is a task for the whole Church, not just part of it. It must be an all-in effort. Every believer must be an evangelist and the congregation become the agent of mission. This insistence is the vital core of 'Tell Scotland' and is being reiterated elsewhere. Moreover, evangelism is no longer regarded simply as a department within the Church for whistling up the winds of God. It is being recognized as the driving force and co-ordinating principle of the entire Christian *ecclesia*.

¹ A. Porritt, *John Henry Jowett*, 96.

² *The Glasgow Herald*, 26th September 1955.

³ Jude 3 (R.S.V.).

⁴ 1 Co 9²².

It is into such a pattern of wholeness that modern methods of evangelism are integrated. The context is essential. Techniques cannot avail of themselves. They can only prove effective in the setting of a sound theology and a Church which realizes that its *raison d'être* is mission.

In preparation for the Methodist year of evangelism in 1953, a series of World Parish pamphlets was produced under the general editorship of Dr. W. E. Sangster and Dr. Colin A. Roberts. 'Twelve Ways of Evangelism' were there outlined, and we can do no better than note the approaches suggested, since they are representative of present-day methods. It will become apparent that these 'modern' techniques are most of them as old as the events recorded in Scripture and that their rediscovery or revaluation arises from the contemporary renaissance of Biblical theology. We shall list them *seriatim* and pass brief comments on them.

(1) *Personal Evangelism*

This is put first because it is first. Its principle is that of win another. One loving heart sets another on fire. This is basic evangelism in any age. It is the original New Testament technique—and this must be our primary source, for, as Canon H. G. G. Herklots has reminded us, 'the key to the understanding of the New Testament documents is that they are the propagandist literature of a widespread and successful missionary movement.'¹ Andrew brings Peter.² Philip brings Nathaniel.³ That was how the Church grew when it was very young. That is how the Church still grows in its maturity. We could well adopt Dr. Frank Laubach's motto, with the minor emendation of one letter: 'Each one reach one.'

It is being realized that personal evangelists require instruction. This is largely an acquired skill. Training classes of all sorts are being set up for this purpose and more are urgently needed if this method of evangelism is to succeed.

(2) *Preaching Evangelism*

Whatever up-to-date technique and apparatus may be employed, the preaching of the gospel can never be outgrown. To every evangelist there comes the challenge and the rebuke of an old Puritan writer: 'Thou art a preacher of the Word: mind thy business.'

This, too, is fundamental in the New Testament. The word *kerygma* conjures up a picture. It brings before our eyes a herald or town crier marching down the street ringing a bell, or maybe in those

days blowing a trumpet to attract attention, and shouting, 'Oyez! Oyez! Hear ye the Emperor's proclamation!' And then at various points he halts to read out the imperial announcement. That is the evangelist's function. He carries a message from the King. It is couched in the indicative not the imperative mood.⁴ 'The primary declaration of Christianity,' writes Evelyn Underhill, 'is not "This Do" but "This Happened."'⁵ The evangelist goes out into the world to make that positive intimation. Whether men will hear or whether they will forbear, he must needs disburden himself of his load. 'For necessity is laid upon me. Woe to me if I do not preach the gospel!'⁶

(3) *Visitation Evangelism*

Once more, this is a New Testament method. A particularly encouraging chapter of St. Luke's Gospel tells of an evangelistic enterprise undertaken by seventy of our Lord's followers. They were commissioned to embark upon a round of visitation. Two by two they went, so the record runs, 'into every town and place where he himself was about to come.'⁷ They were astonished at the results. They met with a quite unexpected response. Returning with elation, they exclaimed: 'Lord, even the demons are subject to us in your name!'⁸ And Jesus disclosed that whilst they were away on this first Christian visitation campaign, He had, in a vision, seen Satan fall like lightning from heaven. 'The passage is of great historical interest,' observes Professor William Manson, 'as marking the significance which Jesus attached to the disciples' mission. However small in themselves the results of the disciples' work have been, Jesus saw them to be symptomatic of a new era in religious history.'⁹

It could very well be that the devils which menace man in this atomic age would be exorcised through a similar campaign. It is a hopeful sign that visitation plays a prominent part in the evangelistic policy of many churches to-day.

(4) *Open Air Evangelism*

Nothing is more native to the New Testament than this type of evangelism. Much of our Lord's own preaching was done in the open air and He never refused a boat as His pulpit or a hillside as an arena for His congregation. When the apostles were driven from the synagogue, they took to the streets and squares of the city and the sermons

⁴ Cf. J. Baillie, *Invitation to Pilgrimage*, 51.

⁵ *Worship*, 68.

⁷ Lk 10¹.

⁹ *The Gospel of Luke*, 126.

⁶ 1 Co 9¹⁶.

⁸ Lk 10¹⁷.

¹ *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament*, 13.

² Jn 1⁴².

³ Jn 1⁴⁶.

of Acts were delivered in the open. This method has been owned of God for two thousand years through a truly apostolical succession of outdoor evangelists, from St. Paul to St. Francis and from Wyclif to Whitefield.

Nowadays, when the gulf between the Church and the men in the street is so lamentably wide, the need to take the gospel to all the places where they foregather is being increasingly felt. Mars Hill has its modern counterpart on Tower Hill and at the Marble Arch, in Birmingham's Bull Ring and on Edinburgh's Mound. Whether it takes the shape of a forum, a witness meeting or a service, it still has a vital rôle to play in the advancing strategy of the Church.

(5) *Team Witness Evangelism*

This, it has been said, 'is a Scriptural method that still has a unique place in the armoury of the Christian Church.'¹ When St. Peter went to present the gospel to Cornelius and his household, he took with him six of the brethren from Joppa.² When St. Paul visited Philippi he was accompanied by Timothy, Silas and Luke.³ The consequences of these ventures in team witness evangelism were incalculable. The first resulted not only in the conversion of a Roman centurion and his family, but in what has been fitly described as the Pentecost of the Gentile world.⁴ The second was the means not only of the salvation of Lydia and the local jailor, but of the founding of an influential church and the inauguration of the mission to Europe.

Witness is to be distinguished from preaching. It is testimony. The witness does not reason, explain or infer. He simply presents the facts of his own Christian experience. He confines himself to saying, 'This is what happened to me.' But amongst those who hear will often be his spiritual counterpart—some one who faces the problem he faced, wrestles with his besetting sin—and the testimony of one who has found in Christ the answer may be the very Word of God to a needy child of His.

(6) *Factory Evangelism*

We pass over this aspect of evangelism with a bare reference, since it is to be the subject of a separate article. We may, however, pause to note its place in the New Testament. When Jesus first called His disciples to forsake all and follow Him, He went to them at their work.⁵

(7) *Letter Evangelism*

The wise and sanctified use of correspondence may rightly be regarded as a method of evangelism. When it is remembered how considerable a proportion of the New Testament was composed in this fashion, the possibilities of such an approach cannot be easily by-passed.

It has been found to be especially suitable for use in suburban areas. A series of letters, either from the minister or an office-bearer, is sent to those known to have no firm church association. The letters begin at the point of good neighbourliness, and move on to mention the need of the community, the training of children and the place of the Church in the life of the town. They culminate in an invitation to come to the church hall for a semi-social evening one week-night. There the recipients meet the minister and hear an address from him in which he offers Christ as the solution to social and personal needs. 'Some of the best families in my church came that way,' reported one suburban minister.

(8) *Film Evangelism*

If evangelism is to be prosecuted 'by all means,' then all the modern media of communication must be appropriated and baptized into Christian usage. Nothing must be called common or unclean. The radio, the television set, the post office relay, the tape-recorder, the gramophone disc—all must be mobilized in the service of the Church. It is into this category of capitalizing the gains of science in the furtherance of the gospel that the use of films in evangelism naturally falls. In a cinema-conscious age there is a powerful aid to the presentation of the Christian message in the showing of top quality films—and, happily, it can no longer be said that 'there does not exist one technically satisfactory religious film which is the work of the Church.'⁶ The performance, however, must not be permitted to sink to the level of mere entertainment, but must always be directed to the single end of setting forth the gospel so as to lead towards a decision for Christ.

Whilst the medium may be modern, the Church is in fact drawing upon one of its oldest traditions when drama is thus utilized in the propagation of the faith.

(9) *Newspaper Evangelism*

The Church is at last awakening to the value of propaganda and publicity. Such terms are being rescued from their less reputable associations. The power of the printed word in the place where many

¹ Cyril A. French, *Team Witness Evangelism*, 3.

² Ac 10²³.

³ Ac 16¹, 11, 19.

⁴ Ac 10⁴⁵.

⁵ Mk 1¹⁶, 19, Mt 9⁹.

⁶ *Towards the Conversion of England*, 103.

read is being acknowledged. What is not so readily grasped is that the Press may offer an opportunity not merely for advertisement but for evangelism.

Quite apart from any large-scale campaign in the national dailies, such as was discussed in *Towards the Conversion of England*,¹ the usual stereotyped Church notice in the local Saturday newspaper may be revolutionized not only by changing its format, but also by including, in an extended section, a genuine message. Churches should more seriously consider the advisability of purchasing extra space on the normal advertisement page to allow for such an effective gospel *communiqué*. We need some one to set a standard in this form of propaganda, as Canon Hedley Hodkin has done for the parish magazine.

Every attempt to reach the masses of the people through the medium of the Press, whether by judicious advertisement or through the regular news columns, is a recognition of the essential nature of the Christian message as *evangelion*—good tidings.

(10) Home Evangelism

Evangelism, like charity, begins at home. Here is the most obvious field for personal witness. Andrew 'first found his brother Simon.'² He became thereby the first home missionary. Every believer should be seeking to win those of his own family and household who are outside Christ. Parents have an unparalleled evangelistic opportunity in the upbringing of their children. In the quest for novel techniques, the mission of parenthood should not be set aside. Too many even Christian parents sit lightly to their responsibilities. They seriously subscribe to the programme facetiously proposed by Charles Lamb—'I am determined that my children shall be brought up in their father's religion—if they can find out what it is.'

There is ample scope, also, for the Christian virtue of hospitality to be turned to evangelistic profit. The New Testament 'Church in the house' is often the answer to the problem of missioning the new building areas. Even one Christian home can become the headquarters of an outgoing witness.

(11) House Party Evangelism

Most of the approaches catalogued here involve moving out to the people where they are. And in the main that must be the pattern of mission. We must make the decision 'to go down into the world of men and show them what we have

¹ P. 116-120.

² Jn 1st.

learned about eternity and beauty' in the realm of the Spirit, as Sir Walford Davies did in the realm of music.³ But there are occasions when the interests of evangelism are best served by retreating from the world that is 'too much with us.' For busy, hurried, harassed people, one of the best ways to bring them under the sound of the gospel, as our fathers used to express it, is to persuade them to go away to the country or the coast for a long week-end and spend the time quietly with Christian men and women in prayer and fellowship.

That is the house-party method. Its potentialities have been recognized and developed largely by the Moral Rearmament Movement, but the churches are learning that here is a valuable evangelistic technique. Indeed, Dr. Horton Davies in his *Christian Deviations*, whilst aware of the theological weaknesses of the Oxford Group, singles out this as one of the advantages it possesses which is worthy of imitation.⁴

(12) Mass Evangelism

Most text-books of evangelism in recent years have tended to assume that special missions have had their day and will soon cease to be. The crusades conducted by Dr. Billy Graham at Haringay in 1954 and at the Kelvin Hall, Glasgow, and Wembley in 1955, have compelled a reconsideration of this means of propagating the gospel and gaining converts. In *Crusade in Scotland* the editor, Tom Allan, confesses that he himself had cherished a rooted conviction about the inadequacy of mass evangelism.⁵ He shared the hesitations expressed in the Church of Scotland statement on evangelism in 1946. But the experiences of the All-Scotland crusade have constrained him, along with many more who joined in that venture, to acknowledge that 'here is a method of evangelism which has been unjustifiably neglected, and which must of necessity play a much more important part in the Church's mission than it has done in the past generation.'⁶

The ingathering at Pentecost, when 'there were added that day about three thousand souls'⁷ after Peter's preaching to the crowds of pilgrims, reminds us that this method bears the stamp of Scripture approval.

This synoptic review of some of the ways of evangelism being practised in the Church to-day must close with a warning. It must not be presumed—and the temptation is acute in this pragmatic age—that technique is the substance

³ Cf. J. S. Stewart, *Heralds of God*, 9.

⁴ P. 98.

⁵ P. 14.

⁶ P. 122.

⁷ Ac 2nd.

of evangelism. It is strictly accidental (in the Aristotelian sense). As was emphasized earlier, the Word is primary. Mere methods, mere schemes, mere endeavours will not of themselves produce the desired effect. Without the tide of the Spirit they may prove as futile as the frenzied activism of Elijah's rivals on Mount Carmel.

'And they cried aloud, and cut themselves after their custom with swords and lances, until the blood gushed out upon them. And as midday passed, they raved on until the time of the offering of the oblation, but there was no voice; no one answered, no one heeded.'¹

¹ 1 K 18^{28, 29}.

Contributions and Comments

The Psalter in the Parish Worship of the Church of England

ONE or two points arise from reading the Rev. H. W. Newell's interesting article, titled as above, in the August, 1955 [lxvi. 323] issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Matins and Evensong were never intended by our Reformers to be the central acts of worship, as the Prayer Book makes abundantly clear. No provision is made in either Office for Notices, Banns or Sermon: only after the Nicene Creed in the Holy Communion is provision so made (in modern Prayer Books, the clause 'and Banns of Matrimony published' which should follow the word 'Communion' in this rubric is omitted).

This clearly shows the Reformers intended the Holy Communion as the central act of worship, following here the New Testament usage: not only is the consecration of bishops, ordination of priests and making of deacons set within the framework of the Holy Communion, but also Holy Matrimony and the Churching of Women, as the rubrics immediately following the end of each of these occasional offices tell us.

The Anglican priest is bound by solemn vow at his ordination to recite Matins and Evensong daily in Church, when the full morning and evening psalms are said. Matins should always precede the celebration of Holy Communion, for our Reformers intended Matins as a preparation for Holy Communion: and then there is no need for the Psalms for the day to be missed.

As your contributor says, one or more psalms should be sung for the Introit, and this is occurring increasingly. The 1928 Prayer Book supplies proper Psalms for each Sunday at Matins and Evensong. For Matins, the Psalms for the Day, as in the Psalter, should be said: then one or more of the Proper Psalms above mentioned for Sundays can be used for the Introit at the following Parish Communion. Or, at the end of the English Hymnal is provided a Proper Psalm for an Introit for every Sunday and major Holy Day in the year.

A*

By these means our people will most certainly not lose their Psalms—as it is most essential they should not—for the devotional and practical value of the Psalter seems to me to stand out clearly: for there is not a situation, individual or national, in every age, for which, somewhere in the Psalms, there is not a message of eternal value.

NORMAN ADCOCK

Cockington, Devon.

Dr. Henry G. Meecham

THE death of Dr. Henry G. Meecham, of Manchester, is a great loss to New Testament scholarship. During the greater part of his ministry he was Tutor in New Testament Language and Literature at Hartley Victoria College and latterly until 1953 was Principal of that College. He was also a Lecturer in the same subject for many years at Manchester University until the time of his death. Many articles, generally upon points of New Testament syntax and exegesis, were contributed by him to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, and in the present issue there is a review from his pen which must be one of the last of his literary contributions. Two works in particular illustrate his fine scholarship and meticulous accuracy—*The Letter of Aristeas* [1935] and *The Epistle to Diognetus* [1949], both published by the Manchester University Press. By a generation of students at Hartley Victoria College he will long be remembered as a wise, learned, and patient teacher, a thoughtful preacher, and a gifted administrator. It was hoped that he would be spared to complete volume III of Moulton and Howard's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, a task for which he was so well equipped by his extensive knowledge of the Papyri, the Septuagint, and later Greek literature, and, above all, by his sound judgment on questions of Syntax.

Among his friends he leaves an abiding memory of modesty, sincerity, and self-sacrificing devotion to duty. Always thoughtful for others rather than for himself, he will remain in the minds of his fellow

students in New Testament research a constant inspiration and example.

VINCENT TAYLOR

Professor J. G. Riddell

THE news of Dr. Riddell's death on 7th September 1955 came to many as a shock. To those who had seen him during the preceding six months there was no shock of unexpected loss, for what was coming was all too plain. Yet their sorrow was deep when the blow actually fell for John Gervase Riddell was a man greatly beloved for his personal qualities as well as highly esteemed for his outstanding gifts of mind. A fragrant memory of him will long survive in his former congregations in Forres and Glasgow. He leaves a big blank in the counsels of ecclesiastical Courts. He has monuments in church buildings which rose in response to his energy and wise planning as successor to Dr. John White in the task of Church Extension. Hundreds of ministers cherish the memory of a clear-headed, warm-hearted expounder of Divinity in their student-days in Glasgow University. This magazine was indebted to him for notable contributions of articles and book reviews.

He had an extraordinary capacity for work. He had a nimble but always orderly mind which was well furnished from a very extensive range of reading not only in his special subject but in general literature. If he could not always solve a

problem at least he could always make clear what the problem really was and for the theological student this is no small gain.

His publications may seem regrettably few, for he was cut off just when the rich harvest of his thought was ripening, but alas! unreaped. We have from his pen *What We Believe*. It is an exposition meant for the general reader of the 'Brief Statement of the Church's Faith' which was issued by a Committee of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. To serve its purpose the book had to be intelligible to the layman, yet underlying the 'popular' presentation one feels that one is in contact with a very expert theologian.

Then we have *Why Did Jesus Die?* Once again the class of reader aimed at includes the non-theologically trained, but ministers profited much from its perusal. Here again one feels the impact of a devout, keen mind, treating reverently and candidly and very helpfully one of the deep mysteries.

We hope to have in our hands, perhaps next year, Dr. Riddell's Croall Lectures on *The Calling of God*. The MS. needs only some editing and the incorporation of some matter which Dr. Riddell expressed a wish to be added from his notes. This editorial task is in the very competent hands of the Rev. John Macquarrie, B.D., who was closely associated with Dr. Riddell as Lecturer in Systematic Theology.

W. D. NIVEN

Literature

PROFESSOR ROWLEY'S FESTSCHRIFT

Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East: Essays presented to Professor H. H. Rowley, M.A., D.D., Theol.D., F.B.A., by the Society for Old Testament Study in association with the Editorial Board of Vetus Testamentum in celebration of his sixty-fifth birthday, 24th March 1955. Edited by M. Noth and D. Winton Thomas (Brill, Leiden; 32 guilders).

We are told in the Book of Esther that the proclamation which preceded the triumphal progress of the Jew Mordecai ran, 'So shall it be done to the man whom the king delighteth to honour.' Professor Rowley, whose name is so familiar to the readers of this journal, has reached a point in his triumphal progress which calls for special celebration, and on the happy occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday his many colleagues in the field of Old Testament studies have delighted to do him honour in dedicating to him this brilliant volume of essays.

The subject is peculiarly appropriate, for all who know Professor Rowley would agree that to none could the title of *Hākām* be more suitably applied. Before speaking of the book, a word may be said about the man in whose honour so many distinguished scholars from all parts of the world have contributed to it. A glance at the select bibliography compiled by his friend and co-secretary in the S.O.T.S., Professor Henton Davies, will give some slight idea of the prodigious industry of the man; but more astonishing than the quantity of his output is its uniformly high quality. He has touched nothing that he has not adorned. But I believe that what he would most wish to be remembered by is the remarkable work which he did during and after the Second World War; with indefatigable energy during that horror of great darkness, when relations were severed and the lamps of scholarship were going out all over Europe, he kept open the lines of communication between England and the Continent. No one will ever know the full extent of his generosity towards

distressed scholars abroad; and when the War was over he was the first to knit up again the torn strands of friendship. The international character of this tribute is the best witness to the success of his unwearied and self-effacing activity. Of the twenty-two essays which compose this book fourteen are by American and Continental scholars.

The book itself is impossible to review in the strict sense of the word; the contributions, though united by a common theme, vary so greatly in style and treatment that one can only record a general impression of the high level of scholarship which would make it invidious to single out any contribution for special praise. I was, however, particularly interested by the contribution of the veteran Swedish scholar Sigmund Mowinckel, who discusses a subject which he has made his own in a very special way—Psalms and Wisdom. His *Psalmestudien*, published over thirty years ago, were a landmark in the history of the exegesis of the Psalter, and his main thesis that a large number of the psalms were of cultic origin is now generally accepted. In this essay he sets out to demonstrate that there is a 'psalmography,' to use his own term, which originated, not in the cult, but among the learned leaders of the 'wisdom schools.'

Another Swedish scholar, Professor Ivan Engnell, whose name has been associated with 'patternism,' and the traditio-historical approach to the problems of Old Testament criticism, discusses 'knowledge' and 'life' in the Creation story with a very fresh and interesting treatment. Professor A. R. Johnson, upon whom Professor Rowley's mantle seems likely to descend, and who has made the study of the Psalter his special field, contributes a valuable essay on the much discussed word *māšāl*, and throws a great deal of new light on it. Professor Kramer presents in facsimile, transcription, and translation a Sumerian text which may well underlie the well-known *ludlul bel nimēqi*, the so-called Babylonian Job. The Swiss scholar, Professor Paul Humbert, discusses in a most stimulating way the 'modernism' of Job, while Professor Von Rad has an important essay on the relation between Job 38 and the ancient Egyptian Wisdom.

But time and space forbid further enumeration of the contents of this veritable 'feast of fat things.' I can only rejoice that so worthy a monument, *aere perennius*, has thus been raised to the honour of so distinguished a scholar, and so loyal a friend.

S. H. HOOKE

CATHEDRAL SERMONS

Before his leaving for the International Christian University of Tokio Professor Emil Brunner was a regular preacher in the Cathedral of Zurich. At

the request of the congregation there these twenty-two sermons, delivered between March 1948 and August 1953, have been published under the title *The Great Invitation: Zurich Sermons of Emil Brunner* (Lutterworth Press; 15s. net). The English translation is by Harold Knight, and the sermons have been prepared for publication by Dr. H. H. Brunner, Pastor of Marthalen, the only survivor of the three sons whom Emil Brunner had particularly in mind over twenty years ago when he wrote his well-known popular study of Christian belief, 'Our Faith.' Here is a circumstance that reminds us of the sadness of the years, but is evidence at the same time that the writer of these sermons is qualified not merely by academic ability but by the testing sorrows of life to speak to men and women on the central truths of their faith.

The title of the volume, taken from the fourth sermon with its theme of the great supper and the reluctant guests, reflects the *motif* of the whole series. Always the preacher is concerned to present the Divine invitation as the heart of the gospel and the answer that is given to it as of momentous consequence. Whether the immediate theme is one of the great seasons of the Christian Year, or a study in Christian obedience and service, or the celebration of a historic event, like the commemoration of Zurich's entry into the Swiss Confederation, the central note of invitation and response is always apparent. Particularly is this true of the type of sermon most commonly included, where a Scripture passage, almost always from the New Testament, is examined both for its original background and its doctrinal meaning so that its implications for our faith to-day are made evident. Here is Biblical preaching, solid and uncompromising, as in the study of Election (Eph 1³⁻⁶); of the Folly and Scandal of the Cross (1 Co 1¹⁸⁻²⁴); of the Last Hour (Mt 25³¹⁻⁴⁶); or Jesus in Gethsemane (Mk 14³²⁻⁴²). There could be no more salutary corrective for the preacher who has got into the habit of basing his sermon on some current topic or beginning with what seems to him an attractive human incident than a serious attempt to follow Dr. Brunner's methods here.

This is not to say that contemporary events are ignored, or that we are offered an other-worldly faith. But the temporal is always set against the eternal, and the realism of the exposition is derived from a deep conviction of the Divine purpose. There is comparatively little attempt to lighten the argument by illustrations, which have perhaps become too prominent in modern 'popular' preaching. One is reminded of James Denney's observation that 'the prime requisite in writing is not illustration but lucidity. If your idea is luminous, from within, you don't need to depend for its being visible or intelligible on casual rays of

coloured light turned on to it from unexpected quarters.' There is no endeavour to offer an easy or superficially attractive message. Such a sermon as that on 'Perseverance in Trial' (Rev 3¹⁰⁻¹³) cannot but have had as disconcerting an effect upon its hearers as the more austere utterances of Old Testament prophecy. Above all, there is no suggestion that the message of the Bible and its implications must be diluted into some easily assimilated form. This is strong meat for adult Christians, and not food for infantile intelligence.

It may be asked how far an average congregation would be able to follow these closely reasoned presentations of Christian faith and fully to appreciate the preacher's message. Perhaps the answer lies partly in the nature of the Swiss Cathedral service and in the quality of the Zurich congregation, where, in Dr. Brunner's words, a believing people 'unites to praise God to its own spiritual fortification and comfort.' It lies partly, too, in the conviction that preaching is within the whole act of worship. The *rapport* between minister and congregation depends not so much on what is uttered from the pulpit as on the common realization of preacher and people that the Great Invitation is being proclaimed, and an answer to it sought, in the context of a common faith. As it is put in the sermon on 'Your Reasonable Service' (Ro 12¹⁻²), 'Have you not often said: the sermon has taught me nothing? But whether the sermon appeals to you is not the main point: the decisive thing is whether *you are offering yourself to God.*'

Enough has been said to show the quality of this book. No preacher would be so foolish as to try to use it as it stands, in a setting different from that for which it was designed. But none will fail to draw from it an enrichment and deepening of his own message. Laymen, too, will find here a nourishing diet for their own faith and a source of strength for Christian witness. In this collection of sermons, if at all, the question which the author raises in his Preface can receive a confident, affirmative answer. 'Preaching,' he writes, 'is essentially a living occurrence which can only very imperfectly be crystallized in writing. For this reason I have up to the present carefully avoided the publication of sermons. But perhaps in this instance the special circumstances will justify a departure from the rule.' Not the circumstances only, it should be made plain, but the quality of presentation of the preacher's theme abundantly justify it, and place every reader under a debt of gratitude which he will gladly acknowledge. J. G. RIDDELL

CYRIL OF JERUSALEM

Probably the most important development in New Testament textual criticism during recent

decades has been the search for local texts, that is, types of text associated with strategic centres of Christianity. In particular the identification of the so-called 'Cæsarean' text (Streeter's designation) has opened up fruitful lines of inquiry. In the first chapter of *The Gospel Text of Cyril of Jerusalem* (*Studies and Documents*, xvii. [Munksgaard, Copenhagen; kr. 16]) its author, J. Harold Greenlee, Ph.D., gives a useful historical résumé of the identification of this text. With a view to throwing light on the nature of the text or texts denoted by the term 'Cæsarean' Dr. Greenlee submits the writings of Cyril of Jerusalem (mainly his 'Catechetical Lectures,' c. A.D. 347), as representing the text current in Jerusalem at that period, to a careful examination. More than five hundred and seventy of Cyril's quotations of the Gospels are noted. Dr. Greenlee is careful to point out that inferences must be drawn with caution, since such factors as allusion rather than citation, inexact quotation, and the tendency to harmonize passages must be taken into account. Nevertheless 'there remains a sufficient body of reasonably dependable quotations to afford a basis for the study of their textual affinities.'

The plan followed is to examine Cyril's text separately for each of the four Gospels. In Mark sixteen out of seventeen of Cyril's variants from the *Textus Receptus* are distinctly Cæsarean in character. Similarly in Matthew (for which Cyril's quotations are the most numerous) the text is Cæsarean in both sections of Matthew (1-11, 12-28) with, as in the case of Mark, a preference in Mt 1-11 for one group (P) against the other (C). For Cyril's text of Luke some thirty-three variants are considered, which again are clearly seen to be Cæsarean in character, though here there is no marked preference for either group. In John forty-five variants of Cyril against the *Textus Receptus* are considered. Here, too, the Cæsarean element is substantial, but with a slight preference for the C group. It should be said that in all cases Dr. Greenlee takes account, in addition to the evidence of the manuscripts, of the other witnesses to the Cæsarean text, namely, the Georgian, Armenian, and Palestinian Syriac Versions, and the quotations in Eusebius and in Origen's Cæsarean text. These naturally vary in evidential bearing, but all have a contribution to make to the character of Cyril's text. The constant testimony of the Georgian Version in particular is striking. Two valuable features of the investigation appear at the end of each Gospel reviewed: (a) a summary of results, (b) an elaborate table of statistics showing all variants and the relevant evidence. To these is added (p. 100) a concise chart, which shows at a glance the conclusions reached.

The discussion throughout is detailed, the data being assembled with great care and skill. Here it must suffice to state the general position held. The text of Cyril is seen to be Cæsarean. In the quotations from Mark this is substantially proved. With respect to the other Gospels there is less certainty, since much less of the Cæsarean element in the Gospels other than Mark has been definitely established. From the Cæsarean character of the Marcan quotations in Cyril it may be reasonably inferred that the text of Mark used in Cæsarea was closely related to that used in Jerusalem in the third and fourth centuries, and the interesting suggestion is made that this presumably common text might well be termed 'Palestinian' rather than 'Cæsarean.' The possibility remains that the Cæsarean text or one of its groups may have originated in Egypt. The origin of the text, however, is of less importance than its character and influence. In this respect Dr. Greenlee's thorough investigation considerably advances our knowledge of the Cæsarean text and points the way to its further and wider exploration. It takes its rightful place among those basic studies so necessary for the interpretation of the New Testament.

H. G. MEECHAM

ST. PAUL AND EPICURUS

Professor Norman Wentworth De Witt, retired from his Chair in Toronto and now settled in Illinois, has issued an expansion of his former scholarly work on 'Epicurus and Epicureanism,' entitled *St. Paul and Epicurus* (Oxford University Press; 32s. net). His main aim, as he himself expresses it, is to show that 'Epicureanism functioned as a bridge of transition from Greek philosophy to the Christian religion.'

He is right in his view that for long centuries Epicurus and his teaching were misunderstood, perverted by prejudice and sheer ignorance. We agree that modern popular usage of 'Epicurean' would have shocked Epicurus who was personally and in his moral teaching a puritan, in some respects an ascetic.

The book is interesting for the numerous examples the author gives of parallelism between Epicurus and St. Paul, and for some proposed new interpretations of New Testament words. With some of them one is disposed to agree. Who are the 'dogs' of whom St. Paul admonishes his readers to beware? Epicureans in the sensualist sense seem quite probable. But when we are asked to believe that Epicurus is the real 'prince of the power of the air' we are not convinced. The author in his enthusiasm for exalting the influence of Epicurus goes in some cases too far. Granted

that Epicurus wrote an Epistle to his followers in Asia, it is not likely that that was a prime factor in inducing St. Paul to write to the churches. Granted that Epicurean communities celebrated a memorial meal in honour of their master, that is only one of many analogues to the Lord's Supper.

Granted that 'love' and 'peace' were great words for Epicurus long before St. Paul's day, we should remember that they were great words for the Jews long before Epicurus was born. The author forgets or ignores the safe, simple rule that for historical explanation of New Testament thought one should exhaust Judaism before turning elsewhere.

The worst and really shocking suggestion in the book is the description of St. Paul as 'the ex-Epicurean.' He gets at this fantastic view from Gal 4³ 'when we were children we were slaves to the elements of the universe' which he takes to mean 'when I was an adolescent I was addicted to belief in the atoms,' i.e., Epicureanism. How could one born and bred a Pharisee have lapsed to Epicureanism without the Pharisees knowing it? And, if they knew, why were they silent about it? (see Ac 26⁴⁶). It just does not make sense, and such a lack of judgment on the author's part shakes one's whole confidence in him.

Quite probably St. Paul had read some of Epicurus's writings. When he felt called to evangelize the Gentiles, like every wise missionary he learned sufficient of the thought of his Gentile hearers to find a promising point of contact with their minds. For that he had ample time between his conversion and the beginning of his missionary journeys.

W. D. NIVEN

A ONE VOLUME COMMENTARY

The Teachers' Commentary (S.C.M.; 21s. net), has now reached its seventh edition. This edition, edited by Professor G. Henton Davies, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., and Professor Alan Richardson, M.A., D.D., has been completely revised. The general articles are notably good. Outstanding are the articles on 'Palestine, the Land and Its People,' by Mary Entwistle; 'The Religion of Israel,' by T. H. Robinson; 'The Theology of the Old Testament,' by H. Wheeler Robinson; 'The Life and Thought of Paul,' by C. H. Dodd. It is in fact perhaps unfair to discriminate, because all the general articles, within their compass, are written by masters of their subject, and combine brevity, lucidity, interest, and a sense of proportion in a quite exceptional way.

There are, however, certain features of this volume which ought to be noted. We do not cite these features primarily as criticisms but rather as

information to anyone who desires to know if this volume will meet his need. It is not a commentary on the whole Bible. It is a commentary on those passages of the Bible which are mainly used and set in the approved syllabuses for schools. For instance, the section on the Psalms deals, not with all the Psalms, but only with Psalms so used. In the Old Testament Psalms receives twenty-one pages, Isaiah eleven, Jeremiah nine, Ecclesiastes two and a half, The Song of Solomon one, Isaiah 25-39 gets thirty-nine lines, Ezekiel has two and a half pages, Nahum receives thirteen lines, Zephaniah twelve lines, the post-exilic prophets—Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Joel, Obadiah, and Jonah—all told get eight pages. In the New Testament Matthew receives twenty-two pages, Mark twenty-three, Luke fifteen, John eleven. Astonishingly the commentary on Romans takes less than three pages, and staggeringly the commentary on the Revelation gets less than one and a half pages. Quite certainly no one need ever try to use this commentary for explanations of difficult and puzzling points. What this book does with excellence is to set out the leading ideas of each Book and succinctly to place it in its historical context; but on matters of detail it is not of any great use.

A book has to be judged by what it sets out to do, and without a doubt this book achieves its purpose. But it raises the whole question of the value of one volume commentaries on the Bible. As a commentary which tried to combine general conceptions with detailed explanation Peake's one volume commentary still stands supreme. The title of this book is 'The Teachers' Commentary,' and very properly it sticks to the passages of the Bible which teachers have to teach. It does set before them the latest and wisest essence of Biblical scholarship; but very reluctantly we are compelled to say that, while the general articles are full of illumination, the commentary itself will have large tracts and areas which are so summary as to be of little or no use to the general reader. Much to our regret we have to say that our general reaction to this book is regret that it came so near to achieving the impossible without quite achieving it.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

THEOLOGICAL LIBERALISM

The author of *Free Churchmanship in England 1870-1940* (Independent Press; 19s. 6d. net) is Dr. John W. Grant, Woodward Foundation Professor of Church History at Union College of British Columbia. He is to be congratulated on a clear and fair history of the rise and decline of

Liberal Churchmanship within the borders of traditional Nonconformity (Methodism is properly omitted). Dr. Grant is principally concerned with Congregationalism, in which the movement can be summed up in three events: the Leicester Conference of 1877, which thought that 'theological opinions can no longer be held essential to religious communion'; the formation of the Liberal Christian League by R. J. Campbell at the height of the 'New Theology' controversy of 1906-1907; and the publication by the Blackheath Group in 1933 of a 'Restatement of Christian Thought' which bore little relation to evangelical theology, and which Dr. Grant describes as marking the end of the liberal epoch.

Dr. Grant sums up in these words the liberal conception of churchmanship: 'Dogma was largely replaced as the basis of church order by religious experience or fidelity to an ideal. Independency was equated with the existence of the minimum of organisation and form. The distinction between ministry and laity was glossed over, the Sacraments made optional or administered perfunctorily' (p. 386). He brings out very well the extraordinary revolution by which men came to believe that these attitudes had always been fundamental to English nonconformity, despite the Savoy Declaration and John Owen. At the same time, Dr. Grant writes of theological Liberalism without the bitterness which has been too common in recent studies. 'Liberalism was in many ways a valuable catharsis. . . . There was in this period much earnest waiting upon the Spirit, and if, as many now believe, the Spirit eventually overturned some of their judgments, that is no reflection on the waiting' (p. 324). In a concluding chapter he suggests that the root cause of Liberalism was the lack of confidence in any kind of dogmatic Christianity once belief in the infallibility of the Bible had disappeared.

Dr. Grant reminds us, however, that Free Churchmanship in these years was not all Liberalism. Since 1933 especially, writers such as Dr. J. S. Whale, Dr. Nathaniel Micklem, and the late Bernard Manning have reasserted not the inerrancy of the Scriptures, but the ultimacy of the Word of God, which is the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. In matters of church polity Liberalism was always centrifugal in tendency, but in 1915 the Baptist Union introduced a system of ten area Superintendents, and in 1919 Congregationalism set up provinces to be supervised by Moderators. Interest both in the Ecumenical Movement and in the possibilities of English Reunion has grown steadily, and it was as long ago as 1918 that Dr. Shakespeare, in 'The Churches at the Crossroads,' amazed many of his Nonconformist brethren by saying that 'it is an idle dream that unity can be secured between

the Church of England and the English Free Churches except upon the basis of episcopacy.'

The book has an excellent bibliography.

JOHN KENT

Under the title *Where Words Come From* (Allen and Unwin; 5s. net; paper covers, 3s. 6d. net) Professor Douglas V. Steere's Swarthmore Lecture suggests that the method of Quaker worship is like that of the priest in 'The Little World of Don Camillo' who comes before the Crucifix to expound and argue out and defend his preposterous and ethically dubious proposals, and then finds that in the silence his assurance wanes, and that the right and it may be harder course becomes clear.

This leads the lecturer to many searching truths about worship, applicable, more perhaps than he thinks, to all worship as much as to that of the Society of Friends.

While the reader will get from this rich and fine essay real insight into the spirit and genius of Quaker worship and note its claim to achieve an order and range comparable to that of an ordered service he may remain of opinion that in practice an ordered service of some kind is more helpful for the average Christian and for the winning of outsiders to the faith.

'Wesleyanism is as much opposed to Democracy as it is to sin.' This saying, attributed to Jabez Bunting, is typical of the impression this dominating figure among John Wesley's successors has made on historians who were less concerned with religious than with social values. In fact the man whom his enemies dubbed 'the Methodist Pope' was not so much an opponent of democracy as a stout defender of what he believed to be the true Wesleyan theory of Church and Ministry.

It is this aspect which is admirably brought out in *Jabez Bunting: The Last Wesleyan*, by the Rev. John Kent (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). Our only complaint is that the title is misleading, inasmuch as Dr. Kent does not attempt any general account of Bunting's life or work. His aim is more clearly stated in the sub-title 'A Study in the Methodist Ministry after the Death of John Wesley.' It is a study of primary interest to Methodists; but in these ecumenical days it is desirable that churchmen of other traditions should understand the reactions of the High and Low Church Methodist outlooks, and Dr. Kent's book opens up this subject in a scholarly and interesting fashion.

How Does Grace Come To Us?, by Canon H. G. G. Herklots, M.A. (Epworth Press; 1s. 6d. net),

is a pamphlet of but twenty pages, yet it is full of spiritual wisdom lucidly presented. We wish it many readers.

To get to know the worth of Samuel Rutherford the modern reader should begin with a judicious selection from his writings; hence we welcome *The King in His Beauty: Extracts from the Letters and Sermons of Samuel Rutherford*, selected by the Rev. J. Cyril Downes, M.B.E., M.A., B.D. (Epworth Press; 6s. net).

Mr. Downes has arranged his extracts under some three dozen headings, such as the Greatness of God, the Love of Christ, Doubts, Humility, Death. Rutherford's spiritual insight, quaint poetic style and devotion to Christ are admirably represented in this useful addition to the Epworth Devotional Books. The ordinary Christian and the preacher in search of a clinching phrase will here find truth set forth in vivid words.

Dust covers can be very deceiving. *New Testament Treasure*, by Dr. W. Gordon Robinson (Independent Press; 8s. 6d. net), is a case in point. The covers carry a sketch-map of a treasure island à la Stevenson with a schooner in the left-hand corner and a compass in the right and, above them on the map, such places as 'Salvation Point,' 'Devil's Rock' and 'Cape Immanuel.' You open the book, thinking that here is something for the very young. Then you are undeceived, and begin to ask, Who is Gordon Robinson? Our guess is that he is the Principal of Lancashire Independent College and Lecturer in New Testament at Manchester University.

At all events, he has produced a very readable book of two hundred odd pages in which he mediates to the ordinary Bible reader, in a delightfully simple style, many of the results of modern Bible Criticism. There are fifty-two chapters, one for every week in the year, each with an attractive title. The first is 'Treasure' and it treats of our Lord's two parables and of Tischendorf's discoveries. The third, which bears the title 'Hidden Signatures,' is about 'the youth in the garden' (who wrote Mark), the 'dear doctor' (who wrote Luke-Acts), 'the converted scribe' (who gave us Matthew) and of course 'the beloved disciple' (whose reminiscences are in the Fourth Gospel). One ultra modern essay is named 'You've had it' and concerns the Greek verb *apecho* used in commercial receipts. And another capital chapter discusses New Testament nicknames.

But we must not try to name all the treasures. The author is obviously a very knowledgeable New Testament scholar, thoroughly abreast of the latest

findings from Moffatt to Mitton. Those who buy his book will find it very pleasant and very profitable reading.

The Bishop of London chose as his theme for his 1954 Lenten Lectures *The Four Great Heresies* (Mowbray; 8s. 6d. net). He deals with the four Christological heresies of the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. — Arianism, Apollinarianism, Nestorianism and Eutychianism. There is, however, prefixed a most illuminating account of the early struggles showing that from a very early period there lay within the thinking of the Church a tension between Semitism and Hellenism, how these had their centres in Antioch and Alexandria respectively, and how from time to time Rome intervened magisterially to compose their differences. The Trinitarian and Christological problems had to be faced. How were Christians who worshipped Christ to conserve monotheism? How could they hold, as they did, that Jesus Christ was at once Divine and human? The heretics took the wrong road. Arius really denied the full divinity of Christ, as long before him the Ebionites had done. Apollinarius really denied the full humanity of Christ by implanting in Jesus the Logos instead of a human spirit. Nestorius was condemned for his apparent dividing of the unity of the Person of Christ, and Eutyches for the contrary error of confounding the two Natures.

Dr. Wand guides the reader skilfully and reliably through the long disputes. He writes out of full and accurate knowledge of the history of the debates with his wonted clarity and felicity of expression. Students in theological colleges will find this an excellent introduction to this part of their studies; and the layman interested to know how and why the venerable Creeds came into being will be sufficiently instructed.

In our May issue we drew attention in these columns to the detailed account of the Greater London Crusade 1954. Now with even greater confidence we commend *Crusade in Scotland*, edited by the Rev. Tom Allan, M.A. (Pickering and Inglis; 8s. 6d. net). The book is in five parts. Dr. William Fitch gives the Story of Beginnings and Preparation, Dr. A. Skevington Wood describes the Counselling and Follow-up, the Rev. Duncan Campbell writes about Publicity, Press and Radio, and the Rev. Tom Allan is responsible for a general description of the All-Scotland Crusade 1955, and for a concluding chapter on Results and Lessons of the Crusade.

Many will wish to have this book as a memento of these memorable days; but we believe that no

Christian will be able to read it without being rebuked, challenged, and moved to thanksgiving. The publishers are to be commended for including more than a dozen excellent photographic illustrations, and the editor and his assistants for a clear, comprehensive and factual presentation.

The Next Step in Civilisation: A Star to Steer By, by F. Creedy (Ryerson Press, Toronto, and Hatchards, 187 Piccadilly, W.1; 15s. net), is the third volume of a work entitled *Truth is Enough*, of which the two previous volumes were 'Human Nature in Business' and 'Human Nature Writ Large.' The author's thesis is that what the world needs for the avoidance of disaster is a common purpose, acceptable to all, and that purpose must be religious, for it is religion that gives us a well-ordered emotional life. By way of example he takes the purpose 'to make men more perfect, more like Christ' and describes an imaginary society, set in the beautiful scenery of the Andes, which lives according to a Christian way of life. Mr. Creedy is on the side of the angels; but he has no use for theology, and one doubts if he knows the subtlety of evil in the human heart. Yet there are many features of real insight and sociological wisdom in his Utopia.

Near the ancient little township of Sigtuna, about thirty miles north of Stockholm, lies the property of *The Sigtuna Foundation* (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). In this pamphlet Olov Hartman gives an impression of the earnest, broadminded and practical spirit which breathes in this large and influential enterprise.

It would be good for us to know more about Sigtuna. But this is tantalising reading for one without any previous information. It creates an irritated desire for the precise facts and figures and programmes which would enable him to appreciate better the reverent affection for the movement which inspires the writer.

One gathers, however, that under the auspices of a very representative body of Trustees there are associated and housed in beautiful surroundings a Conference Centre such as might exist if the Iona Community House in Glasgow were in close proximity to Iona Cathedral; a large co-educational boarding school with the Christian atmosphere characterising the Quaker schools at Bootham and the Mount; and a People's College with the aims of the Nuffield Foundation in Oxford. Throughout the year, besides college courses of all kinds for people over eighteen, innumerable conferences are held in connexion with religious, social and industrial problems.

Important Hypotheses Reconsidered

II. Sanday's Christological Hypothesis

BY THE REVEREND A. R. VINE, M.A., B.Sc., D.D., YORKSHIRE UNITED INDEPENDENT COLLEGE, BRADFORD

WILLIAM SANDAY, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford, in 1910 published *Christologies Ancient and Modern*. The first three chapters gave a brief analysis of the main Christologies from Apostolic times to Ritschl. The fourth and fifth chapters discussed the two trends which Sanday saw in the Christologies of the early twentieth century: that towards scientific rationalism, which he claimed led to a 'reduced' Christianity, and that in line with the ancient orthodoxy, which leads to a 'full' Christianity. He aligned himself with the latter, and in chs. 6 and 7 endeavoured to set out what he considered an essentially orthodox Christology, yet in line with contemporary science, particularly psychology. In ch. 6 he set out some of the developments which had taken place in psychological thought during the latter part of the nineteenth and the first few years of the twentieth century with reference to the unconscious, subconscious or subliminal parts of the mind. He mainly followed F. W. H. Myers and William James, particularly the latter. Three ideas emerge: the unconscious is of the same general quality as the conscious: 'If the dominant impulses and influences in conscious thought and life are good, then the dominant impulses and influences in the unconscious state will be good also; and vice versa. The under-world is a repetition or reflexion of the upper-world. In the one, not less than in the other, character is moulded. And, though the processes are not seen and cannot be followed, their results appear in the conscious responsible acts and thoughts of the waking man' (p. 145); the unconscious is better ordered and more coherent than the conscious: 'And yet the region of the unconscious and subconscious is no mere chaos. The processes that go on there must be to a large extent processes of differentiation and combination. Problems that baffle the waking mind often seem to find their solution, or to make steps towards solution, in ways that are beyond its ken. The next time that the intractable problem comes up into thought, it is with its worst tangles wholly or partially unravelled' (p. 144); the unconscious is therefore the appropriate locus for the divine to act on the human, and we may most reasonably look for divine action on the human soul to take place in the unconscious.

This third idea is really the keystone of Sanday's

Christology. He apparently adopted it with eagerness from William James, from whom he quotes a long passage in support of it. We ought to reproduce at least this much from James: 'Let me then propose, as an hypothesis, that whatever it may be on its *farther* side, the "more" with which in religious experience we feel ourselves connected is on its *hither* side the subconscious continuation of our conscious life. Starting thus with a recognized psychological fact as our basis, we seem to preserve a contact with "science" which the ordinary theologian lacks. At the same time the theologian's contention that the religious man is moved by an external power is vindicated, for it is one of the peculiarities of invasions from the subconscious region to take on objective appearances, and to suggest to the Subject an external control. In the religious life the control is felt as "higher"; but since on our hypothesis it is primarily the higher faculties of our own hidden mind which are controlling, the sense of union with the power beyond us is a sense of something, not merely apparently, but literally true' (James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, 512, quoted by Sanday, p. 147). Sanday adopts the essence of this as a cardinal proposition: 'The first, retrospective, proposition is: that the proper seat or *locus* of all divine indwelling, or divine action upon the human soul, is the subliminal consciousness' (p. 159). By fairly obvious analogy, he at once follows this with a second proposition: 'The same, or the corresponding, subliminal consciousness is the proper seat or *locus* of the Deity of the incarnate Christ' (p. 159).

In ch. 7 he outlines how these two propositions could be applied to explain the life and nature of Jesus Christ. This chapter shows remarkable insight, and is the kernel of Sanday's work. He should have made it longer and more explicit, and his failure to do so accounts, I think, for his approach having been neglected. What he makes clear seems to be this: Jesus Christ is to be thought of as being open on the 'thither' side of the subconscious to the full influence of the divine. His subconscious was therefore perfectly ordered and incontestably right in all moral and value judgments. But 'we think of the human consciousness of the Lord as entirely human' (p. 167), and consequently 'whatever there was of divine in Him, on its way to outward expression

whether in speech or act, passed through, and could not but pass through, the restricting and restraining medium of human consciousness. This consciousness was, as it were, the narrow neck through which alone the divine could come to expression' (p. 167). Nevertheless, as whatever emerged through the 'narrow neck' into consciousness was always of divine quality and authority, He Himself gradually became aware of His unique relationship with the Godhead. It is obvious that such a view at first consideration seems to lead to an adoptionist rather than an orthodox Christology and to an idea of Godhead as qualitative influence rather than specifically personal. This we shall consider. But it must be noted that Sanday was very anxious to emphasize his orthodoxy: 'I should not deny what the Church has ever said. I do not like such denials, and will not make them unless I am (intellectually) compelled. And in this case I do not think that I am compelled' (p. 173). He thought that his view accorded with the Chalcedonian Definition, accepting the 'two natures,' but putting them one above the other, so to speak, instead of side by side: 'Instead of drawing a vertical line, we rather draw a horizontal line between the upper human medium, which is the proper and natural field of all active expression, and those lower deeps which are no less the proper and natural home of whatever is divine' (p. 165). Has not any such view a consequential repercussion on the problem of unity of person? If the problem of ancient Christology was to prevent the idea of the undoubted personality of the divine involving impersonality in the human (though their problem was in the not quite parallel terms of *hypostaseis*), Sanday's view seems to pose the much more serious problem as to how the undoubtedly personal and conscious human consciousness of Jesus can have had anything but an impersonal as well as unconscious divine concomitant. It would seem that the kind of solution advanced by Leontius of Byzantium would have to be somehow worked at from a reverse direction. This is no mere deduction. Sanday himself says: 'The consciousness of our Lord, in His incarnate state, was a genuinely and thoroughly human consciousness. But that does not contradict or exclude the presence beneath it of Deity one in kind with that of God who rules the universe' (p. 209); and again, 'The divine in man

dwells in deep retreats

Whose veil is unremoved.

And the same description applies even to the Godhead of the God-Man' (p. 214).

The reaction to Sanday's book was immediate and in general unfavourable. That, I think, was in part due to Sanday's own attitude. He main-

tained that he was following the line of orthodox Christology; but most of those holding to the orthodox positions must have sensed that if Sanday were right in his main contentions, the consequences would look much more like adoptionism, Godhead as impersonal righteous force, and impersonal divinity in the Person of Christ. Sanday was much shaken by the attacks, especially by those of C. F. D'Arcy and H. R. Mackintosh, and defended and excused himself in a short sequel, *The Problem of Personality in Christ and in Ourselves*. This is rather a sad work. Sanday's confidence had obviously been badly shaken, and he tried with little success to improve the statement of some of his points. He ends with these words: 'Nothing would rejoice me more than if the philosophers themselves, or some of our own philosophically-minded theologians, would take up and work out in their own better way, these problems that I have clumsily adumbrated. Theology, perhaps more than any other science, needs to receive contributions from all sides' (*op. cit.*, p. 75).

Do we, then, leave Sanday's hypothesis among the many futile and rejected attempts to solve the problem of the Person of Christ? By no means; for he was making a perfectly legitimate attempt to relate the facts of the Incarnation to psychological concepts. If, to the orthodox, his ideas seemed to be leading in the wrong direction, it is not sufficient to dismiss them. It must be shown just where he was wrong; and that has never satisfactorily been done. On the other hand, he may unwittingly and unwillingly have adumbrated an approach to a solution of the problem of the Person of Christ on other than orthodox lines. That, too, would have to be faced. Many modern theologians would be willing to follow the arguments without inhibitions. Some might be willing to follow the arguments in the confidence that they could lead to no result that could not be harmonized with the ultimate significance of the ancient symbols. In any case, until the matter is pursued, there can be no assurance that adoptionism and impersonal deity are not in fact true.

First, as to the legitimacy of his approach. There are those—we might perhaps name Father L. S. Thornton and Dr. E. L. Mascall—who would seem to deny that the problem of Christology can be solved in psychological terms at all. They would claim that the only terms other than theological should be metaphysical or ontological. That may well be so, and we do well to remember that psychology, as a science, is normative only in the descriptive field, and that psychology as such cannot pretend to solve ultimate problems. Nevertheless, I would stand with those who contend that contemporary theology must stand *vis-à-vis* with other contemporary disciplines,

being bound either to make its declarations in philosophically systematic concord with the assured results of any particular discipline; or to show that a particular discipline has no relevance to the problems of theology; or—and this, though evidently presumptuous and unfortunate, may sometimes be necessary—to deny, categorically or preferably with reasoned argument, that some particular discipline has alienated itself from the fundamentals of theism. Instead of posing the philosophical question, 'What is the being or nature of Christ?' Sanday posed the psychological question, 'What is the consciousness of Christ?' That is surely a legitimate question. It must be faced, it cannot just be dismissed. It may well be that we shall obtain no convincing answer; but facing the question may suggest a number of conditions which the metaphysical answer must satisfy. I am by no means sure that the immense advances in experimental psychology and in the physiology of the brain during recent years really affect approach to the ultimate problems so much as some people appear to think. The relation between mind and brain is bound to remain outside the true realm of psychology, and with it the nature of consciousness. I cannot see that any advances in psychology will prevent the monist regarding consciousness as merely an epiphenomenon of the functioning brain; nor will such advances throw much light for the believer in some kind of psycho-physical parallelism on the immaterial side of that co-ordination. It follows that the real problems arising from consciousness are all on the yonder side of the boundary between science and metaphysics. Though philosophically the more difficult concept, I suppose the general Christian view would be that consciousness and probably memory pertain to the immaterial part of the parallel, that is, to the individual human spirit, which for convenience we will refer to as 'soul.' Not many would subscribe to James Montgomery's view that at death 'mind and memory flee'; it would seem to reduce the soul to a mere qualitative reactor. If, then, the soul has both consciousness and memory, the problem carries across from the physical to the immaterial: 'How is consciousness related to brain structure?' becomes 'How is the conscious soul possessed of its accreted influences and experiences?' Sanday opens up vast questions relating to the ultra-physical side of consciousness. This is a realm in which practically nothing has been done, and philosophical theologians might well give some attention to it. From the nature of the case assured results will be unobtainable; but all philosophical answers are tentative and have their validity tested by their coherence with the rest of knowledge and metaphysics. I submit that the

implications of Sanday's approach remain to be considered.

Second, as to his relegation of the divine influence to the subconscious. I have already said that first reaction to this idea is hostile, in that it would seem to lead to a conception of God as impersonal righteous force and to the divine in Christ being necessarily impersonal. That is so, and must not be overlooked. Nevertheless, Sanday scores on two very important counts: his view accords with average human experience, and provides a better explanation than most theories of the personal history of Christ Himself. The average Christian is liable to lament that he has no convincing direct evidence of God's personal dealing with him. He does not doubt the witness of the mystic type. He has his few moments of exultation; but even then he wonders to what extent they are induced by emotional circumstance. With whatever words we wrap it up, may it not be that the divine reaches into us in two main ways: one, external evidence coming into consciousness and thence descending into the underlying fabric of our being, so that the acts and evidences of God in His world are accepted and approved; and two, God, who is the ground of our being, through His immanence in the realm of the fabric of our being, exercising in those who are willingly congenial to it, a qualitative influence making for right judgment and action in all circumstances. Might not this account for the difficulty many people feel in realizing the Holy Spirit as personal? God visits us with His influence and quality. If He personalized Himself within our being, we should inevitably be overwhelmed and forced. That would defeat the nicely balanced objectives in the offer of grace. I do not think that Sanday had adequately worked out his idea. But here again there is a field which needs much more exploration. This is even more true when we apply this idea to the personal history of Jesus Christ. Interpretations of history and theories about it interacting as they inevitably do, it is nevertheless true that Sanday's hypothesis can be made to fit the facts very convincingly. His hypothesis excellently provides for development, and has thereby a manifest advantage over theories based on fixed metaphysical categories. As H. R. Mackintosh remarked, 'A static theory of a dynamic reality must prove false' (*The Person of Jesus Christ*, 491). In the ancient terms, development could be conceded to the human nature, but hardly to the divine. The case had to be met by some kind of kenotic theory combined with limitations on the expression of the divine imposed by the limitations of the not fully developed human nature. But that would hardly apply after maturity. Sanday has therefore a very

powerful way of approach, which most certainly needs further consideration.

Something must now be said as to how Sanday's work is to be taken up, and where it is likely to lead. I have already indicated the specific territories that need exploring, and that should be done regardless of consequence: truth must be followed wherever it leads. But when those tasks have been done, there would still remain the formulation of a covering hypothesis, and its nature would inevitably depend upon more general presuppositions. As William James himself recognized, the relegation of religious motivation to the subconscious could be approved from two quite different points of view: it could be taken, as Sanday took it, as evidence of divine action through the subconscious; or it could be taken, as monist psychologists take it, as convincing explanation of religion—what comes up is only what has gone down. Leaving that with stating it, the two main schools of Christian interpretation need remark.

It is difficult to give precise definition to what I have called the two main schools. We might call them Protestant and Catholic, or liberal and orthodox, though either division is very ragged. It may be easier to define the second first. By 'orthodox' I mean those who hold to at least the main positions established in the early centuries, especially as to the Person of Christ and the Trinity. Most of them would wish as far as possible to take into full account the content of contemporary knowledge. This would be the position of Roman Catholics, of most Anglicans, and of many Free Churchmen. By 'liberal' I do not wish to convey the more extreme connotation of that word as current in theological circles a generation ago, but as a broad term to cover those who would admit to being rather to the 'left' of those whom I have defined as orthodox. They do not stand quite so firmly to ancient formulations, they are more anxious to accord with contemporary knowledge, and they are particularly anxious to take up the significance of modern philosophical and psychological insights. They find it difficult to accept the miraculous, but they are passionately convinced that God has confronted humanity in Christ. It has been said, perhaps not quite truly, that they are deists as to the material and theists as to the spiritual. They are sensitive to modern acceptability, and many of them find it hard to think of the Godhead as personal. Interesting light is thrown on all this by a book as recent as Professor H. J. Paton's *The Modern Predicament*. They, I think, might with great advantage work over Sanday's hypothesis. To do so would provide them with perhaps the most likely road to a 'high' Christology which their presuppositions would allow. Keeping to

acceptable categories, it could well be argued that in Christ a difference in kind arises naturally from a difference in degree: in ordinary man the acceptable influence of the divine in the subconscious is never absolutely dominant; it is, so to speak, never more than a percentage, and there is consequent tension. In Jesus Christ the influence of the divine in the subconscious is completely accepted and is therefore completely dominant. There is therefore no tension in the subconscious. That is not to say that there will be no tension in the conscious, because urges and alternatives will present themselves. But there will be no inner tension in assessing the situation: his judgments and values are those of divinity.

To the orthodox there is a more severe challenge. They have tended to ignore Sanday because, if I am not mistaken, they sensed where his views might lead. But surely we must face whatever challenges come to us, and either rebut them or come to terms with them. These are times when the paradox is fashionable, and we might incorporate the insights of Sanday and the orthodox postulates in a series of paradoxes. But that would not be useful. A paradox can at best warn us that the problem is not of easy solution, and may indicate what apparently diverse factors have to be taken into account. I have not space to indicate fully how Sanday's psychological approach could be reconciled with a restatement in modern terms of the essential metaphysics underlying the ancient terms. But I think it could be done with some gain. It would provide a new understanding of the mechanism of kenosis, it would enable a better account to be given of development in Christ, and it would enable recognition to be made of the concept that self-revelation of any hypostasis of the Godhead as personal is necessarily condescension from that which is suprapersonal. It may well be that our own increasing recognition of God in ourselves moves from the impersonal towards the personal in proportion to our willing acceptance of Him, and that the unity of the God-Man arose from the progressive acceptance by that which He had dismissed from Himself of Himself in His comprehensiveness: the divine act of Incarnation involved apparent Adoption.

Sanday failed to resolve the many difficulties inherent in his theory, and we certainly cannot accept it as he left it. But I do not think we ought to dismiss his line of approach as either impermissible or unprofitable. If some of these questions arising from it are worked upon, we may indeed not solve the problem of the Person of Jesus Christ. But we may well gain a little more insight into that most glorious of all mysteries: how the Word became Flesh, and how Manhood found Divinity.

A Fourth Century View of the Origins of Christianity

BY THE REVEREND D. S. WALLACE-HADRILL, M.A., B.D., CHAPLAIN OF ALDENHAM SCHOOL,
LETCHMORE HEATH, WATFORD

WHAT importance has the Old Testament for the Christian? In giving an answer to this question many are tempted to say with Marcion 'no importance at all,' and to seek new bottles for the new wine. Others will adopt the critical, anthropological approach, and trace the gradual emergence of the Jewish religion from the primitive animism of the age of the patriarchs, treating the matter as a study in comparative religion. Others will see the roots of Christianity lying deeply embedded in Jewish faith and practice, and will portray the figure of Christ against a background of Messianic Hopes, Remnant, Sacrifice, and other such fundamentals of the Mosaic dispensation.

The Christian Fathers generally adopted a view akin to this last,¹ and asserted the Jewish ancestry of Christianity, but among them stands the considerable though uncanonized figure of Eusebius of Cæsarea (c. 260–340) who takes a different view. To Eusebius it is not in Judaism proper that the roots of Christianity are to be found, but further back in the pre-Jewish era of the patriarchs. In this era, according to Eusebius, true religion was known and practised, as it was not by the Jews; Mosaic Judaism constituted a declension from the primitive purity of the patriarchal faith. That true faith of the earliest days was reaffirmed by Jesus Christ. This line of thought is argued fully, and with characteristic abundance of illustration and quotation, in the first two books of the *Demonstratio Evangelica*, written at about the end of the great persecution in 313; though with unconscious irony Eusebius claims to follow the example of Jesus ben Sirach and to 'sum up many things in a few words.'² The essence of the argument is found in book i. 2–7.³ The translation used here is that of W. J. Ferrar.⁴

The argument may be summarized under three

¹ E.g., Origen, *Contra Celsum*, ii. 3 ff.

² By the ninth century Eusebius was notorious for his wordiness, for example, Photius, *Bibl.*, xiii.: 'as regards his diction it is by no means either pleasing or brilliant.' For a discussion of the apparently chaotic arrangement of his material, see Lawlor, *Eusebiana* [1912], 136 ff.

³ For a brief exposition of Eusebius' view, see Lietzmann, *From Constantine to Julian*, Eng. tr. by B. L. Woolf [1950], 166 f.; more fully, Opitz, *Z.N.T.W.* [1935], 'Eusebius von Caesarea als Theologe.'

⁴ *Eusebius Proof of the Gospel* [1920].

heads: (a) *Christianity is identical with the patriarchal religion.* Christianity is distinct from Hellenism and Judaism; it has its own characteristic stamp, which is, however, nothing 'novel or original,' but 'something of the greatest antiquity, something natural and familiar to the godly men before the time of Moses.' Similarly the pre-Mosaic patriarchs were neither Jews nor Greeks, yet they were 'conspicuously pious, holy, and just. This compels us to conceive some other ideal of religion, by which they must have guided their lives. Would not this be exactly that third form of religion midway between Judaism and Hellenism, . . . the most ancient and most venerable of all religions, and which has been preached of late to all nations through our Saviour?' Converts to Christianity 'find their place in that intermediate law of life preached by the godly and holy men of old time, which our Lord and Saviour has raised up anew after its long sleep.'⁵ This primitive religion was natural to all men, though this fact did not emerge until Christ fulfilled the promise to the Gentiles.

'If you cared to compare the life of Christians and the worship introduced among all nations by Christ with the lives of the men who with Abraham are witnessed to by Scripture as holy and religious, you would find one and the same ideal.' Like Christians, the patriarchs 'knew and bore witness to the Word of God, Whom we love to call Christ'; the angel of God in Gn 31¹¹, for example, was none other than the Word, and so also was the Divine being of Job 42⁴.⁶ The pre-Mosaic era was not lawless, but was subject to laws which were 'untouched by the Mosaic legislation, but not foreign to the teaching of our Saviour.' So Job 30²⁵ shows the same teaching as Lk 6²¹, 1 Co 12²⁶; Job 31⁹ the same as Mt 5²⁷; Job 31²⁹ the same as Mt 5⁴³; Job 31³³ the same as Mt 25³⁵; and so on.⁷ The function of the Saviour was twofold, first to fulfil the Mosaic law, secondly, to re-introduce the more holy and primitive religion of the patriarchs, and to cause it to be spread among the Gentiles.⁸

(b) *Judaism was local and temporary.* The system of Moses was applicable only to Jews, and only to Palestinian Jews at that. The legal requirements of the Pentateuch are inapplicable 'to those living even a little way from Judæa.'

⁵ D.E., I. ii.

⁶ *Ib.*, I. v.

⁷ *Ib.*, I. vi.

⁸ *Ib.*, I. vii.

'It is clear to you that it was hard enough to follow Moses' rule of life for those who lived around Jerusalem, or only inhabited Judæa, and that it was quite out of the question for the other nations to fulfil it.'¹ Moses and the prophets point forward to the re-emergence of the pure, primitive religion.

(c) *Why then was Judaism introduced at all?* Because of the evil effects of the sojourn in Egypt, after which the Jews needed re-educating as by 'a nurse and governess,' and treating as by a doctor, Mosaic Judaism offered 'a lower and less perfect way' to those who in Egypt had fallen into idolatrous superstition. With the advent of Christ this way was superseded, the curse passed to those who still adhered to the Mosaic system, and the Temple was destroyed by the Romans, signifying the destruction of the whole Mosaic dispensation.²

Eusebius' interpretation of the Old Testament is orthodox in its insistence upon the ideas of sacrifice and the Remnant. Sacrifice is shown as one of the strongest links between Old and New Testaments. Christ, fulfilling in His own person the prophecy of Is 53, supersedes the Jewish ritual sacrifice of animals.³ A further link between the Testaments is the line of succession from the Remnant through the Apostolate to the Church.⁴ 'Which of the apostles of our Saviour or of His evangelists, beholding the inspired power by which "their sound is gone out into all lands, and their words to the ends of the earth," . . . would not bear witness to the truth of the prophecy, which says that God openly will exalt and glorify in counsel and with glory the remnant of Israel through all the world?' The ideas of Sacrifice and of Remnant, of cardinal importance to a right understanding of the position of the Jewish dispensation in relation to the Christian, both find full expression in the thought of Eusebius.

His originality appears in answer to the question 'a Remnant of what?' The view of the prophets themselves in whose utterances the idea of the Remnant appears is that it is a Remnant of the Jewish race remaining faithful in the midst of punishment by God at the hands of a hostile nation. A remnant cannot make its appearance in time until the Assyrian invasion at the earliest. But this is not the view of Eusebius. In a sense, of course, the Remnant was Jewish, in that it consisted of a small minority of the Jewish people, and Eusebius indeed calls it the Remnant of Israel. But to him a Remnant which simply represented the imperfect Jewish dispensation would be pointless. He does not conceive the prophets as looking forward to the Remnant in the future, for they themselves actually constitute the Remnant, and

are the Remnant of the pious and holy patriarchs of the pre-Mosaic age; they are the thin thread connecting patriarchs with apostles.

Why did Eusebius adopt this view? First, because he sought an intellectual position which would be strong polemically against Pagan and Jew alike. Pagan opposition to Christianity at the time of Eusebius needs no emphasis; Eusebius' own *History of the Martyrs in Palestine* remains a primary source of knowledge of the persecutions of that age. In addition there was powerful opposition at the intellectual level from writers such as Celsus and Porphyry. There was also the mutual hostility between Jew and Christian, which is seen for example in the anti-Christian feeling among Jews at the martyrdom of Polycarp,⁵ the anti-Jewish tendency of some of the legislation of Constantine, and the necessity for the composition of anti-Jewish works ranging from the time of Justin to that of Chrysostom.⁶ There could be no compromise with pagan or Jew.

Arising directly from this hostility on two fronts was the extreme sensitiveness of Christians to the charge that their religion was of recent origin, and their anxiety to prove its antiquity.⁷ The charge

⁵ Eusebius, *H.E.*, iv. 15.

⁶ Justin, *Trypho*; Tertullian, *Adv. Jud.*; Origen, *Contra Celsum* (*passim*); Chrysostom, *In Judæos*. See also A. H. M. Jones, *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe*, 220 ff.

⁷ Reverence for apostolic authority followed 1 Co 15³. Cyprian, *Ep.* 73: ' . . . we should return to our Lord and origin, and the evangelical and apostolic tradition'; Theodosius, *Hist.*, i. 4; Athanasius, *Ep. on Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia*, i. 7, express complaints against Arius on the ground that he broke with 'that which also he received'; Eusebius, *H.E.*, iv. 21; 'from them has come down to us in writing the sound and orthodox faith received from apostolic tradition'; Irenæus, *Adv. Haer.*, iii. 3 *apud* Eusebius, *H.E.*, iv. 14; Polycarp proclaimed 'that he had received from the apostles this one and only system of truth which has been transmitted by the Church'; *ib.*: Polycarp 'always taught the things which he had learned from the apostles, which the Church also hands down, and which alone are true'; *ib.* iii. 36: Ignatius 'exhorted them to hold fast to the tradition of the apostles. Moreover he thought it necessary to attest that tradition in writing, and to give it fixed form for the sake of greater security. But antiquity as such carries authority—Tertullian, *Apol.*, 19: 'the first authority is claimed for these sacred books by their extreme antiquity'; Athanasius, *Ep. on Councils of Arim. and Sel.*, iv.: 'after putting in writing what it pleased them to believe, they prefix to it the consulate, and the month, and day of the current year, thereby to show all thinking men that their faith dates, not from of old, but now, from the reign of Constantine'; Eusebius, *H.E.*, i. 2: 'in this way the antiquity and divinity of Christianity will be shown to those who suppose it of recent and foreign origin, and imagine that it appeared only yesterday.'

¹ *D.E.*, I. iii. ² *Ib.*, I. vi. ³ *Ib.*, I. x., III. ii.

⁴ *Ib.*, II. iii., quoting Is 4², Ro 9²⁷⁻²⁹ 11¹⁻⁵.

of recent origin could be levelled against Christians by pagan and Jew alike.¹ The assertion of apostolic authority for Christian belief and practice would carry little weight with men who could trace their cultural ancestry back to Homer and Moses. Eusebius, therefore, not content with the assertion that the loftiest ideas of the pagan philosophers were borrowed from the Hebrews,² goes further to demonstrate that Christianity is more ancient than pagan or Jewish religions. It is a new and improved version of the original and pure religion of the patriarchs; it is the religious system imparted directly and unmediated by God to man in the earliest days; so far from being a newcomer in the sphere of religion, it is the most ancient of all, the original, natural religion of mankind.

As a piece of exegesis, this is in keeping with what we would now call the fundamentalist trend of Judaism. Man was made in the image of God; from his fall began a spiritual decline. On such a view the earliest religion in point of time would be the purest. We may wonder how far Origen took the story of Creation and the Fall at its face value; but Eusebius was more literal-minded than his master.³ It would not be possible for him to consider a growth from primitive to developed; it would be a decline from primitive to adulterated. The adulteration took place in Egypt,⁴ and from the Egyptian period Judaism emerged as a context within which the Remnant could exercise its lonely and patient vigil, awaiting the fulfilment of the promise and the re-emergence of the primitive truth in the glory of the Messianic Age. It may be remarked in passing that the Jewish conception of the Messianic Age is not dissimilar to the interpretation by Eusebius of the golden age of Constantine in which he lived.

In holding this view of the primitive perfection of the religion of the patriarchs, a view which had

been hinted at though not worked out by Justin and Tertullian,⁵ Eusebius was arguing something like a doctrine of natural religion. The patriarchal religion was universal, at least potentially so, for Eusebius had to recognize that during the patriarchal age the rest of the world was given over to barbarism.⁶ It was based upon 'universal principles.' In beginning his narrative of the patriarchal age Moses 'drew his teaching from universal principles, assuming God was the cause of the universe . . . from universal principles he next advanced in his argument to particulars.'⁷ Eusebius always insisted upon the intellectual nature of pure religion.⁸ 'From that most gloomy darkness, as it were, the Word by its divine power delivered both Greeks and Barbarians alike, and translated them all into the bright intellectual daylight of the true worship of God the universal King.'⁹ This is no narrow intellectual pursuit for the learned; it is the universal way; it is for all men.¹⁰ Moses, we may feel, would have been as surprised to hear that he worked from general principles to particulars as he would have been to hear that Plato was but himself 'speaking Attic Greek.' Yet if Christianity, the bright intellectual daylight of pure religion, is a republication of the primitive patriarchal religion, and if the same strain of purity is to be found running through the Remnant of which Moses himself forms part, then the intellectual content and philosophical nature of true religion must be sought in patriarch and Moses just as in Christ. Abraham, Remnant, and Christ bear witness in their several ways to the truths propounded by God from eternity. Mankind has returned to these truths in Christ, and has found his rest in the spiritual haven where he began and which is natural to him.

In conclusion, it may not be thought too fanciful to illustrate the thesis of Eusebius from Wordsworth's *Intimations of Immortality*. The poet writes from the standpoint of the Remnant, midway between the original unclouded vision of truth and its ultimate realization. The vision is lost but for an occasional glimpse:

But yet I know, where'er I go,
That there hath past away a glory from the earth.

¹ Origen, *Contra Celsum*, i. 26, note Celsus' scornful phrase 'a few years ago'; *ib.* iv. 36: 'Celsus imagines that Hesiod and the innumerable others, whom he styles inspired men, are older than Moses and his writings, that very Moses who is shown to be much older than the time of the Trojan War.' Celsus argues that the religions of the Athenians, the Egyptians, the Arcadians and the Phrygians are older than that of the Jews, and therefore much more so than that of the Christians.

² Eusebius, *Prae. Evang.*, xi. 10: 'What else is Plato than Moses speaking Attic Greek?'; cf. Origen, *op. cit.*, iv. 36.

³ Origen interprets the story mystically, *Contra Celsum*, iv. 40. But note Jerome's remark (*Comm. on Isaiah*, V.) that where history fails him, Eusebius strays off into allegory.

⁴ *D.E.*, I. vi.

⁵ Justin, *Trypho*, 19, 23, 25; Tertullian, *Ad. Jud.*, ii.

⁶ *D.E.*, I. ii.

⁷ *Prae. Evang.*, xi. 4.

⁸ His word is λογική. See Stevenson, *Studies in Eusebius*, 22.

⁹ Gifford's translation [1903] of ἐν νοερὰν καὶ φωτεινὴν ἡμέραν.

¹⁰ Cf. Philo Alex., *Deus immut.* 30, the path of philosophy is a broad highway and a royal road for all who choose to tread it. See Kirk, *The Vision of God*, 42.

Eusebius writes¹ 'in this intermediate period . . . the ideal of the new covenant was hidden from men, and as it were asleep.' Wordsworth writes :

Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting.

But the rare moment of vision comes even during the sleep :

¹ *D.E.*, I. vi.

Hence in a season of calm weather
Though inland far we be,
Our Souls have sight of that immortal sea
Which brought us hither,

and the bitter experience of poet and prophet alike make those moments the sweeter. But Eusebius wrote as one for whom the 'visionary gleam' was a thing past. The full glory of the bright intellectual daylight had dawned.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

The Right Kind of Operation

BY THE REVEREND JAMES WRIGHT, M.A.,
BOAT OF GARTEN

THERE are boys and girls who haven't fathers and mothers to look after them, and the church to which I belong, and other churches too, have homes for them where good people try to bring them up in the right way. I know one of these homes well, and I know the children there so well that the whole twenty-two of them call me 'Uncle.'

Among them is a boy, Alec, and Alec is a 'wee mischief.' You can see it in one look at his bright black eyes. He is never out of trouble for long and never done making trouble for those who have charge of him. Well, one day, he was just out of one spot of mischief into another and the matron was at the end, or nearly, of her patience with him. 'Oh, Alec,' she said, 'is there nothing we can do to make you a good boy?' At once Alec answered, 'You might try getting my tonsils out.'

I'm afraid that would not help. Getting the tonsils out will sometimes make ill boys into well boys, but never bad boys into good ones. But I don't think really that Alec requires to have anything out. It would be a great pity if he were to stop being a lively and high-spirited boy. God, who made him, I am certain does not want him changed from a naughty boy into a nobody.

What Alec needs is not anything taken out, but something put in and that something 'Thoughtfulness.' If he could only get into the way of thinking of other people and the effect on them of what he does, then he would still give them surprises—but pleasant surprises. He would not exasperate those who look after him, but he would often make them laugh. That's the change Jesus would like to make in Alec, and could make and may yet make—and in you, too, if you are like Alec.

TEMPERANCE SUNDAY

Not Knowing How To Stop

BY THE REVEREND P. N. BUSHILL, B.A.,
EASTBOURNE

'At the last it biteth like a serpent.'—Pr 23³².

Among some interesting newspaper cuttings I have one which shows the photograph of the front part of a railway engine appearing through a strong high wall. This unusual sight caused dismay among passers-by near Tunbridge Wells West railway station one day and delight among the children. It appears that a young cleaner was at work 'servicing' this engine when he thought he would like to move it nearer the coal dump for refuelling. He had not yet learned much about engines, but he did know that by opening the regulator the engine should move. And it did! But unfortunately the young cleaner had not yet learned how to stop an engine, and so, on it went to the end of the engine shed and was fast making its way through the brick wall when another man—more experienced in the mechanism of an engine—jumped on and brought it to a standstill on the very verge of catastrophe.

That picture reminds me of a very sad plight occasionally seen—a drunken man, reeling to and fro, and uttering all sorts of silly words: or it calls to mind the story of a family in rags because the family income has been wasted on intoxicating liquor.

None of the guilty people, I feel sure, really meant to get drunk, or to have to appeal for public assistance to help to feed and clothe their children.

I remember as a youth admiring my older brother's motor bicycle: how lovely it looked, how powerfully it moved, how sweetly it purred. One day he let me ride on it; he told me how to start the engine, and off I went. I suddenly realized that he had not told me how to stop it! What should I do? Well, I decided that I would

keep on taking the first turn to the right, in the not unreasonable belief that I should thus eventually come back in front of our house. And there was my brother waiting for me. 'How do I stop the thing?' I cried out. He told me what lever to move, and I did it: otherwise I might have still been cycling round and round to-day!

That is the trouble with strong drink. You can easily be taught how to start. But who can tell you how to stop? That is quite another matter, and young people sometimes do not think about that any more than the young engine cleaner thought about it at Tunbridge Wells. Remember what the Bible says about wine—'At the last it biteth like a serpent,' and a serpent's bite can be fatal!

The best way of knowing how to stop is not to start at all. Join the glad company of those who for their own sakes and for the sake of their families are total abstainers.

The Christian Year

FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT

Christ's Offer of Wholeness

BY THE REVEREND JOHN L. KENT, M.A.,
CATHCART, GLASGOW

'Wilt thou be made whole?'—Jn 5⁶.

Scores of invalids lay under the shadow of the five porches, all of whom must have awakened the compassion of the Lord Jesus Christ, but He chose this man. Why?

Perhaps he alone could give Jesus what He required for His miracle. Certainly on many occasions Jesus demanded a particular response before He made a man the recipient of His grace. Threading His way among those sick and broken people clustered around the pool, He paused at this paralytic, gazed steadily at him, and said to Himself, 'Here is the response I want.'

True, the gifts of God are free but they cannot be received without an intensity of desire to possess them. 'You cannot stroll into the Kingdom of God,' someone has said, 'pushing the door open with a careless shoulder.' Neither can we be made participants in the supernatural life of Christ with an offhand and indifferent gesture. Free, yet at a price! And this man was ready to meet the cost of being made whole.

See what he was willing to pay for new life, and ask ourselves if we have the same price to offer.

He was aware of his great need. That does not seem much to offer and yet it was fundamental. Both the nature and the duration of his illness could easily have blunted the sharpness of his

desire. But acceptance might have led to listless acquiescence, and acquiescence to a supine dependence on people's charity. Imagine! Thirty-eight years of it! Had this sense of need died, who could have blamed him? But it had not. 'Oh, to be made whole!' That was his cry.

Dr. Fosdick says, 'There is no truer test of the status of any creature in the scale of existence than the size, amplitude and quality of his needs.' A swollen pay packet, hearty meals, a well-equipped house, plenty of leisure, an abundance of amusement and too many people have all that they want.

But man needs a view of life that does justice to his nature as an intelligent being. He cannot be satisfied until he has settled for himself his place in this bewildering world. His idea of himself is the determining factor in his experience. Is he, as a modern man has described himself, 'a ridiculous toy in the littered cupboard of the universe'? Or is he, as Paul put it, meant to attain to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ? This question is a fundamental and inescapable demand of his nature. He may drift or strive, may live quietly, content with some obscure office or struggle vigorously for recognition and power, may be driven by some fierce ambition or seek to spend himself for the good of his brothers—all in response to the view he has of himself. And if his image of himself is wrong then he is chasing elusive ambitions and his policies are destined for disaster. Let's face it. Deep down in our souls we all feel the irrepressible urge to discover the true idea of who we are and why we are here. Each one of us needs to come to terms with himself. Where do we stand in this great issue of life? Let us bring this need to Christ.

Man needs a faith to withstand the buffetings of life. To everyone they come, those isolated or persistent shocks that shake us to our foundations. We may be serene for a while, surrounded by sweet and smooth waters, but soon the streams will rise, the winds will lash and the angry surge and swirl will threaten to engulf us. A sudden death, a crippling illness, a failure of resources or nerve and a man's faith is put to the final test. None of us is exempt from it. It is man's universal need. Let us offer it to Christ.

Man needs a power to deal with his sins. It mortifies him that he can control the atom but he cannot control himself. And it is because he cannot control himself that his control of the atom is so fraught with peril. Ignatius Loyola's words might be applied to any of us: 'He put on spurs to ride a fiery horse, but no bridle.' It is not that man is wholly depraved. On the contrary, his high endowments, his acquired

skills and his virtues demonstrate the nobility of his being, yet he is for ever falling short of complete fulfilment. He can never attain his exalted objectives because of unbridled elements in his nature. 'All we like sheep have gone astray,' quotes Rogue Herries in Walpole's novel of that name. 'Nay, rather,' he protests, 'like gods, lost in a strange land.' His weakness, folly and sin misguide and bring to nought man's best endeavours. He is in desperate need of a power beyond himself to cancel the guilt and break the power of sin. Let him bring this need to Christ.

This man still believed that his need could be met. And he might quite easily have given up all hope. Think of it. Every time a fresh inflow, with its medicinal properties, broke upon the surface of the pool, he struggled to step in or called to some compassionate person to help him. But no, some one was there first. Season after season it happened. But his optimism remained undiscouraged.

In the experience of most of us such a spirit is a rare commodity. The facts of life tend to moderate and modify men's expectations. They set out with high ideals, but when these are unrealized they reduce their demands on life. The process of modification continues until they make no demands on life at all. Clues to man's true significance are hard to come by and when disappointment follows disappointment, they abandon the quest altogether. A faith with which to stand up to life keeps on eluding them, so they surrender the effort. Their sins persistently defeat them, therefore they capitulate to despair. They end, at best, by simply drifting along; or they join the ranks of the scorners and blend their voices with the man who cried, 'Three sneers for everything and three cheers for nothing.'

Some there are, however, who do not allow life to snuff out the candle of hope. 'Let us thank God,' wrote Martin Niemöller from his prison cell to his parish in Berlin, 'that He upholds me as He does and allows no spirit of despair to enter into Cell 448.' And as evidence of his undaunted spirit he would put his table below his barred window and, standing on it, would read the Word of God in a loud voice to the prisoners assembled in the court below. That is the spirit with which Jesus can work His miracles of grace.

This man offered his will to be made whole. His intense desire and his undaunted hopefulness found their expression in a surrendered will. The persistent disappointments of the years had not quenched his longing or stifled his high expectancy and therefore all that he was rose effectively into the realm of Christ's redemptive will.

Only on these terms can man's basic needs be met. Augustine knew that. 'On all sides Thou

didst show me that Thy words are true; but drowsily I replied, "Presently, let me alone for a little while"; only this presently of mine had no present, and the little while drew out into a long time.' So with us. 'This is your place in the universe,' says Christ, the living, crucified and glorified One. 'Come to Me and receive your status as a son of God destined for His eternal fellowship. Wilt thou?' And we answer 'Presently.' 'Here is the faith,' says Jesus. 'Receive it and you will be more than sufficient for whatever shocks life may give you. Wilt thou?' 'Presently,' we say, and when the crucial test comes we find that we cannot stand up to it. A dedicated and obedient will—that is what Christ demands as the price of our moral and spiritual renewal.

God's will towards us has been made plain through the coming of His Son into the world. His heart's desire is that His children should be made whole. Pleadingly He confronts us in Jesus and says, 'Wilt thou be made whole?' If desire is still alive within us and if we believe that He has the capacity to meet our every need, let us commit ourselves to Him. Our wills are ours to make them His. It is the only way in which our perishing souls can be saved.

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT—BIBLE SUNDAY

The Word of God

BY THE REVEREND JAMES MUNN, M.A.
GLASGOW

'Thy word is a lamp unto my feet.'—Ps 119¹⁰⁵.

'His word was . . . as a . . . fire . . . in my bones.'—Jer 20⁹.

In the old, sombre library of Trinity College, Dublin, I was looking at the Book of Kells, the most beautiful copy of the Gospels in the world. For a thousand years it has remained the crowning glory of the art and piety of medieval Ireland. Each page is ablaze with colours so expertly mixed and nobly designed that they have defied the passing centuries and engaged the wonder of the world. Suddenly a wave of tourists gushed into the gallery and descended on the famous book; they hopped and chattered around it—and then pushed on to the next attraction on their list. It was sufficient to have looked at the craftsmanship of the writing, but they could not afford time to notice the message. These, however, are not the only ones who throw a glance at the Word of God, who glimpse a phrase there for a minute and then dash hastily back into the traffic of the world. Yet what in sober fact is the Divine

intention for the Word of God in the lives of Christian men?

1. *The old Psalmist once said 'Thy word is a lamp unto my feet.'* It keeps happening so often that it cannot be written off as the fiction of a hectic imagination. A traveller in a blizzard has lost all track of road or fence or hedge; half-blinded by the swirling storm, he stumbles to a cottage window, the only light he can see, and is saved. Or the seaman who has fought his way out of the fierce clutch of the breakers which have wrecked his ship crawls up the beach and clammers over the rocks to reach the one place which offers him hope, a house with a lighted window. The lamp which shines into the darkness is a sign of shelter and help.

Now nobody wants a lamp at all unless he is in an unfamiliar place where he may run into trouble. So the Psalmist is saying that when life is difficult for him, when his thought is stumbling and groping, when his faith is endangered, then the Word of God is a lamp for him.

Is not this why some are losing their way and losing heart, they have lost this light? Cynically they ask, 'What is the Truth?' Dazed by misfortune they cry, 'Where is God?' With anguish and fear they watch the tumult of the world and demand, 'What is the use of love in a world like this? What chance has brotherhood here?' There is just no hopeful answer at all apart from God. If we hear no word from the Lord it is no matter who else calls. The strong man, the smart man, the successful man cannot speak to the fundamental needs of our time. No sinful man can circumvent the evil in his own heart or in his neighbour's. No sinful man can drive out sin from the world. No sinful man can bring men into harmony with the mind of God. If we will not give heed to the Voice of God and the Word of God, no strategy or invention or alliance will remedy our plight or rescue us from despair. In a drawer full of odds and ends I found some old torches, relics of war-time; they awakened memories of darkened streets and dangerous nights; but they give me no light now! So for us old shibboleths and theories, old excuses and paganisms lie to our hand; but these give us no light, no help. This is the only light: 'Thy word is a lamp unto my feet.'

2. *Jeremiah tells us His word 'was as a fire in my bones.'* Poor Jeremiah! He was caught between two forces. On the one hand men laughed at the message he preached in the name of his God, hooted him clean out of sight! So stung and disgraced was he, he felt he could never do anything with that message again. He had got his fingers burned, and once was enough of that. But on the other hand and at the same time,

instead of feeling that he had settled the matter he felt worse than ever! He had in Cromwell's phrase 'a fire in his belly;' and who can have peace when inside him burns a searing, flaming fire which he cannot put out? No use Jeremiah fighting against it: something was *ordained* for him to do; something he *must* say. The thing was driving him, consuming him; and to look the other way, to plunge into a frenzy of good works, to plead weakness, was only to guarantee inner futility; all his nerve would soon be gone. There was only one way to peace; he had to bend his will to the will of God, he had to harness his obedience to the Word of God. *Then* the inner fire was no longer destructive; it became a secret force, the dynamic which urged him out to victory!

And does not the Church stand to-day where Jeremiah stood then? It is shot at by its critics—for its divisions, for its evangelism, for its irrelevant presentation of its message, for its narrowness or its slackness, for its want of action on social questions. Yet a word lies in the very bones of the Church, tormenting, unquenchable; we cannot silence it, we cannot crush it, for it is the Word of God.

God has committed only one trust to His Church, His Word for men. Was not this the fire that burned in William Tyndale as he planned the translation of the Scriptures into the language of the people? 'If God spare me,' he said, 'I shall one day make the boy that drives the plough in England know more of the Scriptures than the Pope.' His translation was lost in a shipwreck, but it was printed again. It was banned by the bishops and burned in London. Tyndale himself was arrested and died at the stake. But the Word of God had driven him on and on in His service; it was a fire that could not be put out. Was not this the fire that carried Livingstone to Africa, Chalmers to New Guinea, Christie to Mukden, Grenfell to Labrador? East and West and North and South were men and women to whom Christ was an unknown name and the wonder of God's seeking love an unglimpsed mystery. So neither slave traders nor cannibals, solitude nor violence could hold men so commanded by the Word of God. And is not this the same fire that is kindling in the Church in Scotland to-day? For what is the Tell Scotland movement but just our response to that inner fire? We have nothing else to tell Scotland save only the Word committed to us of God. 'Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel,' cried Jesus. 'His word was as a fire in my bones,' said Jeremiah. 'Woe is me if I preach not the gospel,' wrote Paul. And what man in all Scotland has the right to keep back that gospel? Or who will defend himself from the Judgment if

he attempt to damp down the fire of God? They said of Martin Luther, 'His conscience was captive to the Word of God.' But freedom, and greatness, and breadth of living are in such captivity. So may the conscience of Christ's Church answer the Word of God until the whole land is a burning and a shining light for Him.

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT

The Peace of Godlessness or the Peace of God

BY THE LATE PROFESSOR D. M. BAILLIE, D.D.,
OF ST. ANDREWS¹

'And he was in the hinder part of the ship, asleep on a pillow.'—Mk 4³⁸.

There are two places in Scripture where we have a picture of a man lying fast asleep in a boat in the middle of a raging storm.

The first place is in the story of Jonah. You remember that ship which he took at the port of Joppa, bound for Tarshish, that he might escape from Jehovah and his unpleasant duty; and how a terrible storm came upon the ship, and the crew were in great trepidation. 'But,' says the story-teller, 'Jonah was gone down into the inner parts of the ship; and he lay, and was fast asleep.' That was a scene on a big vessel on the Mediterranean Sea.

And then here in the Gospels we have a similar touch in a story of a storm on the Lake of Galilee. It was a little fishing-boat, manned by disciples of Jesus who until recently had been fishermen themselves. And a sudden storm sprang up, one of those squalls which would be very common on that little inland sea surrounded by hills. The fishermen were in a great panic. 'But,' says Mark, 'Jesus was in the stern, asleep on the cushion.'

The comparison of these two pictures, and the contrast between them, may give us something to reflect upon. We may use them as parables of human life, as illustrating two very different kinds of mental tranquillity and peace.

It might perhaps seem fanciful to put together two such different stories, from such different parts of the Bible. Only it seems quite likely, as some scholars have thought, that St. Mark himself was conscious of the similarity when he wrote his story. Of course he knew the story of Jonah well, and from the way in which he tells this story of Jesus, from the language he uses, and especially from the turn of expression in this verse of our text, it seems that perhaps he had the older story

of Jonah in mind. And if *he* was thinking of the one while he was writing the other, we may well put the two side by side.

Moreover, a great number of readers have been struck by the similarity. In each of the stories you have the man sleeping peacefully through the storm. And in each you have the crew coming to waken him, and they ask the sleeper wonderingly how he can lie there through the danger.

These are the resemblances. But then, with all that outward resemblance, there is an inward difference between these two sleepers. Jonah was at ease because he thought he had escaped from God; while Jesus was at peace because He was sure of God's love and care. And it just reminds us that there are these two kinds of tranquillity—the tranquillity of atheism and the tranquillity of faith; the peace of godlessness and the peace of God.

Let us think of these two kinds.

(i) *The peace of godlessness.* This voyage of Jonah's was a godless voyage. He had shaken off responsibility, put God and duty and heroism and idealism out of his life for the time. Having left the land of Israel behind, he thinks he has left its God behind too, and his mind is easy now, he doesn't care. So he sleeps soundly.

Of course it is true that when God does come into our lives He does trouble us. And so some people succeed in preserving their tranquillity by leaving out all the pains of aspiration, all the struggles and strivings after better things, all the hard plodding of the path of duty, all the pains of sympathy and pity, all the burden-bearing which this sad world needs. They go on their way sleek and comfortable, with never a sleepless hour of the night for their own sins or their brother's needs. They are quite contented and happy and peaceful in the midst of this great spiritual drama of human life, though there is nothing in their hearts and lives but the world and self and getting and spending and comfort and pleasure.

And there is nothing noble or beautiful or enviable about that kind of tranquillity.

Some people succeed in preserving that mean kind of tranquillity in their hearts all their lives long. But I must go on to say that we are nearly all tempted to seek that kind of tranquillity. It is so easy in this world to become engrossed in getting and spending and enjoying oneself, and so to go through life easy and happy in a shallow kind of way. We are all apt to run away like Jonah from duty and responsibility and God, and so to find a worldly tranquillity, like Jonah asleep in the cabin of the ship.

But if there is anything divine in us at all (and there is some spark of the Divine in every one of us), then we can never find a very deep peace in

¹ From Professor Baillie's unpublished sermons we have selected a small number and these are appearing in consecutive issues.—Editor.

that way. And I dare say most of the people who seem to be absolutely contented with the world know in their own hearts that they have not found the secret of happiness and peace. It is not a very deep peace, the peace of the world.

(2) *The tranquillity of faith, the peace of God.* I don't think it is fanciful to find a parable of that in the picture of Jesus asleep. I think that is the great interest and charm of this story of the storm on the lake—that it shows us the bearing and behaviour of Jesus in a situation of real physical danger. Jesus was absolutely cool and collected and calm, and He was surprised at the panic of the disciples, surprised that men who professed to be religious should lose all the calm of their religion in a moment of danger. 'Why are you afraid?' He asked. 'Haven't you got faith yet?' He had. He really believed in God, believed that they were all in God's keeping. So He had the calm and courage of faith.

And so it was throughout the life of Jesus. He bore the burdens of all men and the burdens of the Kingdom of God, but He bore them without worry, He carried about with Him the peace of God.

Yes, and He was always recommending that way of facing life to the common people around Him. They had their own worries, those common cares which are the same in all lands and in all centuries. You might think that with the worry of it all they would have no leisure of mind to listen to a preacher of religion like Jesus. Ah, but the religion He brought was just for such people in such a workaday world as ours; and Jesus Himself knew all about it, for He Himself had come from a humble home. And His message to these people was not to worry, and His cure for worry was to trust in God. He said: 'O you people of little faith. Do not worry with "What shall we eat?" and "What shall we drink?" and "Wherewithal shall we be clothed?" These are the things the Gentiles seek, but your heavenly Father knows you need all these things. *You* seek His Kingdom, and all these things shall be added unto you.' He actually told these poor people, with all their cares, not to worry, to stop worrying about their livelihood, and bravely trust in God; and then they would have peace and leisure of mind to turn to the quest of God's Kingdom. And then, in the spiritual cares of God's Kingdom too, He would not have people worry. There also they were to trust in God's love and power. 'Fear not, little flock; it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.'

Apparently that was one of the characteristic things in the original Christianity: that secret of getting away from worry to the peace of God. We find it repeatedly in the New Testament. Again we read: 'When you are brought before

judges for My sake, do not worry beforehand as to what you are to say; for it will be given you in that hour what you are to say.' And again Paul, who had learned his Master's secrets so well, says to his friends at Philippi: 'Do not worry about anything, but make your wants known to God by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving. And the peace of God, which passes all understanding, will keep your hearts and minds in Christ Jesus.' That was an alternative to worry, a better way than the way of anxiety—this method of committing one's way to God and bringing one's wants to Him. And the result, Paul said, would be a wonderful inexplicable kind of peace, a peace which couldn't be accounted for by anything in the outward circumstance, a peace which went beyond one's understanding; for it depended, not on the absence of trouble, but on this habit of keeping the soul with all its wants turned to God.

In our day, as in Christ's day and in Paul's, most lives have plenty of troubles and cares. And there is nothing on earth more difficult than to keep from worrying about them, to rise above anxiety into peace. But let us realize that our Christianity ought to teach us in some degree to do it. We ought to know something, amid all our cares, of what it is to trust in God and so to be kept in peace. It should not be always just anxious days and restless nights. 'It is vain for you to rise up early, and lie down late, and eat the bread of sorrows, for God giveth His beloved sleep'—sleep like Jesus, in the midst of the storm.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT

The Rich Young Ruler

BY THE REVEREND OWEN E. EVANS, M.A.,
B.D., MANCHESTER

'There ran one to him, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?'—Mk 10¹⁷ (R.V.).

Mark's account does not reveal the identity of this inquirer, but the context makes it clear that he was a rich man. Matthew tells us that he was a young man, and Luke describes him as a ruler. Consequently he is generally referred to as the 'Rich Young Ruler.' In fact, however, neither the man's age nor his social position is of any great importance. The important facts about this inquirer are three in number. (1) *He is a prosperous man and yet is dissatisfied.* For all his material possessions, he feels a sense of emptiness in his life which prompts him to come to Jesus

seeking the secret of 'eternal life.' (2) *He is a good man and yet is deficient.* Although he can claim to have observed all the Commandments from his youth, he realizes that something more is required of him if he is to inherit eternal life. Matthew makes this realization explicit in the form of the question, 'What lack I yet?' (3) *He earnestly desires eternal life and yet is unwilling to accept the conditions of that life.* When he heard the conditions 'his countenance fell . . . and he went away sorrowful.' These three facts suggest three corresponding reflections upon the attitude of our generation towards what the gospel calls 'eternal life.'

1. *The discontent of man without eternal life.* Not many people of our generation could honestly admit to being completely satisfied with the life that they are living. In the Welfare State, life has become economically more secure and materially more prosperous and comfortable than ever before, but men and women to-day are not noticeably more contented and happy than were their fathers and grandfathers whose lot was much harder. Modern man is still conscious of a vague sense of emptiness in his life, and looks anxiously in various directions for something that will satisfy his needs and give him true contentment. Most people seem to labour under the illusion that, if only they can add a little more to the material comforts and possessions they already enjoy, complete happiness will be theirs. They do not realize that they are trying to satisfy a spiritual need by material means—which is no more possible than it is to satisfy physical hunger by spiritual means. When a man is starving, he needs not a sermon but a square meal. And when a man's spirit is restless and dissatisfied, he needs not more of the things of the world but more of the things of God. 'Thou hast made us for Thyself,' said St. Augustine, 'and our hearts are restless till they find their rest in Thee.' To seek rest unto our souls in any other direction is to 'spend money for that which is not bread, and your labour for that which satisfieth not.' The food for which our generation is hungering, did it but know it, is not 'the meat which perisheth' but 'the meat which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of man shall give.'

Jesus, Thou Joy of loving hearts,
Thou Fount of life, Thou Light of men,
From the best bliss that earth imparts
We turn *unfilled* to Thee again.

2. *The inadequacy of morality to secure eternal life.* If, as we have seen, there is a danger for man to mistake the cause of the emptiness which he feels in his soul and to seek to fill it by material means which cannot satisfy, there is also the further danger that, when at last he has come to realize

that what he needs is that quality of life which the gospel calls 'eternal life,' he should make the mistake of thinking that this life is something to which he himself can attain by his own moral effort. 'Master, what shall I *do* that I may inherit eternal life?' The Rich Young Ruler's question is still echoed by many who look upon eternal life as a reward to be received hereafter for right behaviour and good deeds done here and now. The Rich Young Ruler thought in these terms—though, as we have seen, he was aware that mere morality was not enough. Being able to claim that he had observed all the Commandments from his youth, he was nevertheless conscious that he lacked what was necessary for the inheriting of eternal life. For this he is to be commended; most of us, were we able to make a similar claim, would display a Pharisaic self-righteousness, patting ourselves on the back and saying with that little prig Jack Horner, 'See what a good boy am I!' Moralism inevitably produces such an attitude of self-satisfaction, and therein lies its danger, for the self-righteous, just as much as the unrighteous, is excluded from the Kingdom of God. It is not the ethics of the Ten Commandments as the *condition* of entrance into the Kingdom, but the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount as the *result* of entrance into the Kingdom that constitutes Christian morality. The entrance itself is not something to be earned, but something to be received as the free gift of God's grace. 'Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to *give* you the kingdom.' The only condition laid down for the inheriting of eternal life is the willingness to receive it humbly and gratefully.

3. *The unwillingness of many to face the consequences of accepting the gift of eternal life.* We have seen that the only condition is the willingness to receive the gift. But—and as Shakespeare says, 'there's the rub'—this willingness to receive eternal life as a gift involves certain inevitable consequences which have to be faced.

'One thing thou lackest,' said Jesus to the Rich Young Ruler, 'go . . . sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven.' These words of Christ to this particular inquirer do not necessarily mean that *every one* who wishes to inherit eternal life must fulfil them literally. What they *do* mean is that every one who so wishes must be willing to forego *anything* that will prove a hindrance to his receiving, and living, the life which Christ offers to him. And everything that comes between him and Christ will be such a hindrance. It was because the young man's riches were a barrier between him and Christ that he was told to get rid of them. The principle here is exactly the same principle

as appears in that other stern word of our Lord, 'If thy hand cause thee to stumble'—that is, if it proves a hindrance to thee—'cut it off: it is good for thee to enter into life maimed, rather than having thy two hands to go into hell.' Material prosperity can very easily become a barrier between us and eternal life—as the teaching that follows the story of the Rich Young Ruler so clearly shows—and so can all the glittering prizes that this world can offer us. There is no reason why we should not enjoy these prizes, should they come to us, but we need to guard against becoming too attached to them. We must never set our hearts so firmly upon them as to be unable, should the need arise, to detach ourselves from them. We are so made that, in the final analysis, our hearts cannot be set, at one and the same time, upon two incompatibles. They cannot belong to Christ and to the world at the same time. And to inherit eternal life means

that henceforth our heart belongs to Christ, and to Him alone. It means that His hold upon us must be stronger, and more secure, than that of any one or anything else. We may as well not desire eternal life at all unless we are going to desire it more fervently than we desire anything else, unless we are going to desire it so fervently as to be willing, if need be, to forego everything else in order to gain it. For 'the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a merchant seeking goodly pearls: and having found one pearl of great price, he went and sold all that he had, and bought it.' If we covet eternal life as much as that, it can be ours here and now, and ours for eternity. If we do not, there is nothing for us but to 'depart sorrowful,' to enjoy the things of this world until death parts us from them. But in that case we may not expect to find contentment or rest unto our souls, neither in this world nor in the world to come.

Entre Nous

The Social Gospel

'The difference Christ can make has been seen not only in the places where folk live, but also in the places where they labour. A foreman in one of Glasgow's large engineering works was notorious for his bad language and equally bad temper. He was consequently unpopular and exercised a degrading influence on those who worked under him, especially the young. He went to the Kelvin Hall, despite his previous declarations that he had no time at all for Billy Graham, and although he did not actually come forward then in open confession of Christ, his life was completely altered. His foul language and temper disappeared overnight. The workers under his charge hardly recognize him now and, what is more, he is gaining friends where before he only made enemies.'¹

Daily Life

The great and important characteristic of *The Daily Life of the Christian*, by Mr. John Murray (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net), is that it is an intensely practical book. It is a long time since we have seen a book which so genuinely tried to face the problems of every-day life. It has three sections. The first is entitled 'On and Off Duty,' and contains chapters on Work, Home, Leisure, The

Cinema, and Sunday. The second is entitled 'The Great Adventure,' and contains chapters on Falling in Love, Getting Married, and Parenthood. The third is entitled 'Social Responsibilities,' and contains chapters on Money, The Local Community, The Christian in the Welfare State, and Patriotism. The book concludes with an Epilogue on The Personal Relationship Behind It All. Mr. Murray begins by saying: 'It has been said that the Church has traditionally provided a pattern of Christian living for the man who stayed awake all night to pray and sing in a monastery chapel, but she has not provided a pattern for the man who was kept awake all night by his crying baby.' The book is full of apt and unusual quotations. Canon Peter Green once said that 'for Christians the home was the scene of their greatest opportunities but all too often they made it the scene of their greatest failures.' On Monday morning we must remember that the Christian life 'is drill as well as thrill.' The time of the engagement which precedes a marriage is the time 'when we are using our minds to discover whether our hearts are to be trusted.' Mr. Murray suggests certain tests to be applied to any man who offers himself as a candidate for public office. He should be competent to fulfil his duties. He should possess some power to express his mind, to exercise a firm judgment, and to make decisions which are based on a grasp of the situation and the issues involved in it. He should be an unselfish man who does care for the good of the

¹ A. Skevington Wood, in *Crusade in Scotland*, 77.

whole community. He should be a man of courage whose master is conscience and not expediency.

Spiritual Values in Shakespeare

The Rev. Dr. Ernest Marshall Howse has written a fascinating book with the title given above. The publishers are the Abingdon Press (\$2.50). It consists of a series of lecture-sermons given at week-night meetings in Dr. Howse's church in Toronto. The plays which Dr. Howse discusses are 'Hamlet,' 'Othello,' 'Macbeth,' 'King Lear,' 'Richard the Third,' 'Julius Cæsar,' 'The Merchant of Venice,' and 'The Tempest.' In Shakespeare Dr. Howse finds 'that "stretching of the soul in wonder and amazement" which has been a timeless characteristic of great religious literature.' Shakespeare supremely possesses that which is necessary to give greatness to any art, 'the hint of eternity.' The great keynote of the Shakespearean tragedies is 'What life does to you depends upon what life finds in you.'

Dr. Howse finds in Shakespeare three great principles. The first is that *individuals matter*. 'Altogether Shakespeare's plays are a picture gallery of 250 individual characters.' 'In a day when the individual is expendable, our spirits can welcome the reinforcement of that classic insight.' The second great principle is that *individuals are responsible*. 'Man is the architect of his own fate. He works out his own salvation.' 'He sends us out from the plays feeling not helpless but rather awed, pitiful and reverent, and knowing that the issues of life are in the heart. "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves."' The third great principle is that *we are living in a moral order*. 'One might take a general text for all Shakespeare's tragedies: "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."' The one thing which Shakespeare's tragedies lack is the suggestion of *any power to redeem*. Shakespeare was the observer, but not the evangelist.

The Lozenge

'An anthology of pages suited to engage serious thought, one for every day of the year, gathered from the wisdom of many centuries' has been prepared by Principal John Baillie (*A Diary of Readings*, Oxford University Press; 21s.). An extract from Von Hügel's 'Selected Letters' opens the volume and serves to show Dr. Baillie's purpose in making the collection:—

'That daily quarter of an hour, for now forty years or more, I am sure has been one of the

greatest sustenances and sources of calm for my life. Of course, *such "reading" is hardly reading in the ordinary sense of the word at all*. As well could you call the letting a very slowly dissolving lozenge melt imperceptibly in your mouth "eating." Such reading is, of course, meant as directly as possible to feed the heart, to fortify the will—to put these into contact with God—thus, by the book, to get away from the book to the realities it suggests.'

As one would expect from Dr. Baillie, the anthology is catholic, the fruit of his wide reading. The source of each quotation is given in detail. The format of the book is most attractive.

The quotation which we have chosen and give below is from F. W. Faber's 'Spiritual Conferences.'

Kind Listening

'There is a grace of kind listening, as well as a grace of kind speaking. Some men listen with an abstracted air, which shows that their thoughts are elsewhere. Or they seem to listen, but by wide answers and irrelevant questions show that they have been occupied with their own thoughts, as being more interesting, at least in their own estimation, than what you have been saying. Some listen with a kind of importunate ferocity which makes you feel that you are being put upon your trial, and that your auditor expects beforehand that you are going to tell him a lie, or to be inaccurate, or to say something which he will disapprove, and that you must mind your expressions. Some interrupt, and will not hear you to the end. Some hear you to the end, and then forthwith begin to talk to you about a similar experience which has befallen themselves, making your case only an illustration of their own. Some, meaning to be kind, listen with such a determined, lively, violent attention that you are at once made uncomfortable, and the charm of conversation is at an end. Many persons whose manners will stand the test of speaking, break down under the trial of listening. But all these things should be brought under the sweet influence of religion. Kind listening is often an act of the most delicate interior mortification, and is a great assistance towards kind speaking. Those who govern others must take care to be kind listeners, or else they will soon offend God and fall into secret sins.'¹

¹ J. Baillie, *A Diary of Readings*, Day 314.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.